

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

JAN 25 1954

## CONTENTS

	PERIODICAL READING ROOM	PAGE
SPITZER, LEO.—Lope de Vega's "Al Triunfo de Judit,"		1
McCLAIN, W. H.—Soviet Russia through the Eyes of Zweig and Rolland,		11
WILSON, K. G.—Five Fugitive Pieces of Fifteenth-Century Secular Verse,		18
LITZ, FRANCIS E.—Experiments in Poetry: Father Tabb,		23
GRIGGS, E. L.—Notes Concerning Certain Poems by Samuel Taylor Coleridge,		27
LOOMIS, R. S.—Was There a Play on the Martyrdom of Hugh of Lincoln?		31
RUGGIERS, P. G.—Words into Images in Chaucer's 'Hous of Fame,' a Third Suggestion,		34
REILLY, C. A.—Chaucer's Second Nun's Tale: Tiburce's Visit to Pope Urban,		37
HAMP, ERIC P.—Gothic IUP 'Arw,'		39
BISHOP, MORRIS.—Figuière and La Rochefoucauld,		41
OWEN, JOHN.—A Euphemistic Allusion to the 'Reeve's Tale,'		43
KIRCH, MAX S.—Note on the 'History of Jack the Giant Killer,'		44
WILLIAMS, PHILIP.—A 1593 Chaucer Allusion,		45

## REVIEWS:—

J. E. GILLET (ed.), <i>Propalladia</i> and Other Works of Bartolomé de Torres Naharro. Vol. III. [John Corominas.]	46
AKE BLOMQVIST (ed.), <i>GAGE DE LA BUIGNE, Le Roman des Deduis</i> . [Raphael Levy.]	50
FERNAND DESONAY, <i>Ronsard Poète de l'Amour. I. Cassandre</i> . [H. C. Lancaster.]	51
GEORG LUKÁCS, <i>Deutsche Realisten des 19. Jahrhunderts</i> . [Gerhard Loose.]	53
R. D. GRAY, <i>Goethe the Alchemist</i> . [Heinrich Meyer.]	55
BERTHA MUELLER (tr.), <i>Goethe's Botanical Writings</i> . Introduction by CHARLES J. ENGARD. [Heinrich Meyer.]	57
F. A. SCHMITT, <i>Beruf und Arbeit in deutscher Erzählung, ein literarisches Lexikon</i> . [Arno Schirokauer.]	59
HEINZ KINDERMANN, <i>Meister der Komödie von Aristophanes bis G. B. Shaw</i> . [Heinz Moenkemeyer.]	60
HERMAN SALINGER (tr.), <i>Twentieth-Century German Verse</i> . [Helen Mustard.]	62
L. S. MANSFIELD and H. P. VINCENT (eds.), <i>HERMAN MELVILLE, Moby-Dick</i> . [W. H. Gilman.]	63
H. W. DONNER, <i>Två Kapitel Engelsk Grammatik</i> . [N. E. Eliason.]	65
C. C. FRIES, <i>The Structure of English</i> . [N. E. Eliason.]	66
E. J. H. GREENE, <i>T. S. Eliot et la France</i> . [George Boas.]	68
C. B. WICKS, <i>The Parisian Stage. Part II (1816-30)</i> . [H. C. Lancaster.]	70
URSULA BROWN (ed.), <i>Porgils saga ok Hafliða</i> . [Stefán Einarsson.]	71
CYRILLE ARNAVON, <i>Les Lettres américaines devant la Critique française: 1887-1917</i> . [Oscar Cargill.]	72
JOHN STAFFORD, <i>The Literary Criticism of "Young America": Politics and Literature 1837-50</i> . [William Charvat.]	74
BRIEF MENTION: SAMUEL REISS, <i>The Rise of Words and their Meanings</i> ; P. ANTONETTI (tr.), ITALO SICILIANO, <i>Les Origines des chansons de geste</i> ,	75
CORRESPONDENCE: MILTON'S GOLDEN CHAIN,	76

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER  
KEMP MALONE  
ARNO SCHIROKAUER

DON CAMERON ALLEN  
CHARLES R. ANDERSON  
EARL R. WASSERMAN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, R. D. Havens, E. Malakis,  
L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price is \$6.00 in the U. S., Pan American countries, and Spain; \$6.25 in Canada; and \$6.50 in other foreign countries. The price of single issues is \$1.00.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

## THE FINER TONE

### KEATS' MAJOR POEMS

By EARL R. WASSERMAN

Mr. Wasserman's perceptive reading of the poems combines an intimate knowledge of Keats' works, including his letters, with the most rewarding and salutary approaches that have been developed in recent criticism. Texts of five of the poems — *Ode on a Grecian Urn*, *La Belle Dame Sans Merci*, *The Eve of St. Agnes*, *Lamia*, and *Ode to a Nightingale* — are included.

"The sensitive and perceptive studies that make up [this book] are almost a model of the way in which the explication-of-the-text method should be applied to one of the great Romantic Poets." — W. J. Bate.

1953

236 pp.

\$4.00



The Johns Hopkins Press

HOMEWOOD • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103  
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

litors  
on the  
scrip  
ticles  
to the  
es of  
Quo  
, no  
MP.  
litors  
business





# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume LXIX

JANUARY, 1954

Number 1

---

## LOPE DE VEGA'S "AL TRIUNFO DE JUDIT"

(*Rimas humanas LXXVIII*)

Cuelga sangriento de la cama al suelo  
El hombro diestro del feroz tirano,  
Que, opuesto al muro de Betulia en vano,  
Despidió contra si rayos al cielo.  
Revuelto con el ansia el rojo velo  
Del pabellon á la siniestra mano,  
Descubre el espectaculo inhumano  
Del tronco horrible, convertido en hielo.  
Vertido Baco, el fuerte arnés afea  
Los vasos y la mesa derribada,  
Duermen los guardas, que tan mal emplea;  
Y sobre la muralla, coronada  
Del pueblo de Israel, la casta hebrea  
Con la cabeza resplandece armada.

This sonnet must be understood, as its title indicates, as a poetic description of a *trionfo*, that Italian Renaissance revival of the Roman *triumphus* pageant which was granted by the Roman senate to the *imperator*. The two words in the title *trionfo* and *Judit*, evoking ancient historical climates opposed to each other, are symbolic for that Renaissance synthesis of the classical and the Judeo-Christian world in which aesthetic and moral beauty could harmoniously join forces. (A poetic expression such as *ninfas de Judea* used by St. John of the Cross in his pastoral-religious poetry has the same ring of suprahistorical beauty in which two worlds are united). Within our sonnet the identity of Judaea and Rome is repeatedly suggested in the use of the word 'tyrant' for the Assyrian

general Holophernes (the poet is able thus to designate him since to him the siege of Bethulia is brazen usurpation of power directed against the Republic of God: cf. in the hymn of *Judith* 16, 18 the words *vae genti insurgenti super genus meum!*), in the mention in line 4 of the Jovian thunderbolt (which crushes the rebellious [*opuesto*] Holophernes who appears this time as one of the Titans whom Jupiter thrust to the Tartarus), in the typically Latin poetic metonymy *Baco*<sup>1</sup> for *vino* (cf. Virgil, *Ecl.* V: *multo . . . Baccho*), and in the replacement of the common ethnical term *judía* (cf. Lope's *Judía de Toledo*) by its Latinizing equivalent *hebreá* (which was also the term of the Vulgate *Judith* 14, . . . : *una mulier hebreá*). It was then the concept of the triumphus that inspired the Romanization of the Biblical subject matter. In Renaissance art we find several Old Testament<sup>2</sup> figures raised to the dignity of triumphant Roman conquerors borne on a *currus triumphalis*, for example David (the Bible tells us only that Saul "conquered" thousands, David tens of thousands), Joseph (who, according to the Bible, was ordered by Pharaoh to ride in a chariot as the "father of the land" of Egypt),—and the Queen of Sheba, cf. Werner Weisbach, "Trionfi" (Berlin 1919, pp. 76 seq.). Surely the words addressed in the Biblical story (15, 10) by the highpriest of Jerusalem and the citizens of Bethulia to Judith: "Tu gloria Jerusalem, tu laetitia Israel, tu honorificentia populi nostri" must have suggested to Renaissance artists—with whom the stylization of Jewish into classical heroes was customary (witness Donatello's Judith in Greek style)—representations of the conqueror of Holophernes as a *Judith triumphans*. Whether Lope had seen an actual painting of a "Judith triumphans" I am not able to say. Now in a typical *trionfo* the conqueror was presented as riding in the *carro trionfale*, holding in his right hand a wreath of laurel while

<sup>1</sup> The reading in this passage *Vestido Baco, el fuerte arnés afea los vasos y la mesa derribada* (f. inst. in Lope de Vega, *Poesías líricas* published in Espasa-Calpe's *Colección austral* No 274, 1942) is not understandable to me: *vestido Baco* would have to be an apposition to *el fuerte arnés*, but how could the poet have said that the armour (not Holophernes) was 'a clothed Bacchus'? (in allusion, supposedly, to the fact that Bacchus was generally represented as naked?)

<sup>2</sup> The Christian version of a *triumphus*, of course, is either a triumph of humility (Christ riding on Palm Sunday into Jerusalem on an ass) or of transmundane impact (Christ returning to heaven after his resurrection). Cf. also St. Paul, Col. 2, 15.

a figure symbolizing the Goddess Victory held another wreath above his head, and behind the chariot were dragged the chained figures of prisoners (the motif of the *prigioni*, so characteristic of Michel Angelo) and the spoils of battle. In the case of David, Joseph and the Queen of Sheba the décor centering about the chariot was given explicitly by the Biblical story—but how should a triumph of Judith be represented (whether imagined by Lope or by a painter who preceded him)? The dimension of length (present in a pageant) will be replaced by the dimension of height: the scene will take place on the high walls of the city, those same walls which thanks to Judith have withstood the "tyrant," and this impression of height is built up within the poem as we turn our eyes from the scene in the tent up toward the walls. The captives as well as the spoils of battle, traditional in a *trionfo*, will be replaced by the simple trophy: the head of Holophernes. Of the elements of the Roman ritual there will remain only the "coronation," but the armor of the conqueror is at least suggested by the word *armada*: Judith is holding before her the head as a shield. In the Biblical story the moment most nearly approaching a 'triumph' and most easily visualizable in a painting (or description of a painting) is the moment after Judith's return to Bethulia when, followed by her handmaiden carrying the head of Holophernes in a leathern bag, she had called up to the guards on the walls to throw open the gates, and then, having ascended to a high place on the walls ("ascendens in locum eminentiorem"), shows her trophy to the priests and the populace there assembled.

In the paintings of the Renaissance the interpretation of the heroine's emotions varies, ranging from passive or humble acceptance of duty to exultant pride, from dispassionate sobriety to artful coquetry or fascination by her victim's lust. Judith is represented in those paintings in one of three significant moments: the scene of the decapitation itself (Caravaggio), the moment immediately following (Michel Angelo), and the return to Bethulia as she and her handmaiden move forward exultantly (Botticelli).

In the Middle Ages the story of Judith, like so many edifying Biblical or hagiographic legends, was treated in a cycle of pictures in which the whole story is told (e. g. in the 11th century Catalan Bible of Farfa, v. Neuss, *Die altkatalanischen Bilderhandschriften*, and in the 12th century illustrations to Herrad of Landsperg's

*Hortus deliciarum* v. Frances G. Godwin, *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 6th series, xxxvi [1949], pp. 25 seq.)—whereby the emphasis falls, not so much on the person of Judith and her feat, which were to be singled out by Renaissance individualism, but on the will of God which materializes itself in an extraordinary event through his human instrument. In the series of illustrations to the *Hortus* the most striking scenes are those of the beheading in the tent and of the city walls with its cupolas and towers on which two burghers are visible and by the side the head of Holophernes impaled—which two pictures happen to find themselves arranged one below the other. We may wonder whether the spatial arrangement of the two scenes in Lope's sonnet was not inspired by just such a chance juxtaposition (my learned friend Erwin Panofsky—to whom I owe the reference to the *Hortus*—is unfortunately unable to say whether an iconographic tradition offering this juxtaposition existed in Spain). In any event the two scenes in Lope's sonnet constitute a condensation of a medieval cycle centering around Judith. Though the poem is in contrast to the more leisurely narrative effect of the medieval illustrations, still the emphasis on civic triumph rather than personal exploit (*coronada del pueblo de Israel*)<sup>3</sup> is comparable to the spirit of the latter; yet this was inspired by the Renaissance idea of the *trionfo*, here ascribed to the *casta hebrea*. With the word *casta* Lope has chosen to maintain the orthodox simplistic psychology of the Biblical account according to which the pious Judith was capable of her great act because of the chaste life she had led during her widowhood (sophisticated cleverness being all on the side of that Jehovah who has found this particular human instrument for his theocratic-political purposes).<sup>4</sup> Whereas many of the Renais-

<sup>3</sup> I believe that the editor of Lope's *Poesías líricas* is wrong in omitting the comma after *muralla*. It is not the wall that is crowned (with the Jewish population), but Judith (with the wreath of the triumphator). Indeed the participle *coronada*, coming as it does before the mention of Judith prepares us for the full appearance of the heroine in resplendent light.

<sup>4</sup> Very pertinently Martin Opitz in the preface to his translation of an Italian Judith play (1635) praises the clever exploitation of her chastity by that heroine in the service of her people ("die Handhabung der Keuschheit . . . weil sie Gott um die Gnade des Betrügens bittet, mit Herausputzung und liebkosenden Worten ziemlich weit gehet, und eines und anderes vorgibt, das einem Frauenzimmer sich gleichwohl allerdings nicht geziemet").

sance and baroque painters, troubled by the apparently dual nature of the heroine, had tended to represent her either as herself stimulated by erotic tension or else as a dehumanized instrument of God's will, Lope is suggesting that she could be attractive but, because of her chastity, not attracted. This religious *trionfo* then is a revelation of the victory of good over evil: *casta hebrea* in our poem is opposed to *feroz tirano*.<sup>5</sup> Judith brandishing the head of Holophernes on the walls of Bethulia, in the open pure air, not in the fetid atmosphere of a dimly lit tent fitted for amorous encounter, is an ancient *imperator* as well as a warrior of God; in contrast to the ugly wine-stained *arnés* of the lecherous Holophernes in the tent, her body shines (*resplandece*) as though clad in heavenly light. We may note that the *trionfo* with which the poem is allowed to end in an aura of light and air and altitude, of joy and morality, takes up only the last tercet whereas the bulk of the poem is devoted to the gruelling scene in the tent (a structural asymmetry in the sonnet characteristic of baroque art). The acceleration that usually accompanies the foreshortened two last stanzas of a sonnet is here delayed until the final tercet which begins with the conjunction 'and,' thereby presenting the final picture as an immediate consequence of what preceded and has by this same token all the greater impact: the triumph of God through *la casta hebrea* comes quickly and sweepingly.

By the compression of a medieval cycle into a double picture the relationship of the lower picture to the whole has changed. Medieval cyclic technique admitted the repeated presence of the head of Holophernes in the sequence of different illustrations: in the *Hortus deliciarum* we see the head now in the scene of the decapitation in the tent, now in that of the women marching toward Bethulia, and finally when the head itself is the main figure, impaled on the walls of the city—a typical medieval device of repetition whereby the symbolic object was didactically impressed on our minds just as in a religious sermon the main theme is textually repeated over and over again by the preacher. Thus on the bronze doors of the church at Hildesheim the symbolic apple in the one scene of Adam and Eve's

<sup>5</sup> The words *feroz tirano* may also suggest the traditional rôle, in a baroque martyr play, of the oppressor of the monotheistic religion who usurps the power of God in acting against his elect people. Cf. Calderón, *El mágico prodigioso* I, v. 623; "la tiranía de los gentiles crueles / su sed apaga en sangre / de la [iglesia] que en mártires vierte."



temptation was allowed to appear five times as a reminder to man to resist the devil; similarly the repeated head of Holophernes in the *Hortus* is a symbol of the ineluctability of the divine will before which must succumb the heroic body of Titans and giants (*Judith*, 16, 8). In Lope's sonnet on the contrary, though two scenes are represented, the head, as well as its captor Judith, appears only once, in the scene of the *trionfo*, while in the scene of the tent it is the torso that is described. The spatial interval between tent and walls is telescoped by the immediate juxtaposition of the two parts of the poem (bound together by the conjunction 'and')<sup>6</sup> as if to remind

<sup>6</sup> The connective 'and' implies that the author has interpreted (and consequently has calmly mastered) the events in the outward world which he records: it is he who has surveyed them, discovered their concatenation and delimited the closed sequence to which they belong. In the Biblical line *Dixitque Deus: fiat lux! et facta est lux* there is the calm establishment of the concatenation of cause and effect; quite the contrary is the asyndeton *veni vidi vici* which, with its lack of connection, that is of interpretation, gives the impression of emotional agitation. Obviously, the greater appears the incongruity of the events connected by 'and,' the greater will be the effect of the mastery achieved in connecting them—and in truth the account of the creation in which God's command and the realization thereof appear so naturally connected, as if there were no need of explanation, is invested with the character of sublimity (recognized already by Longinus). Our 'and' in Lope's sonnet has the same sublime character: the head of Holophernes brandished by Judith on the walls and his maimed torso in the tent appear mysteriously connected; indeed, the physical connection between head and body which had ceased to exist has been replaced by the spiritual connection of God-willed punishment and triumph. Over the scene of dismemberment there reigns the peace that comes with understanding of the plans of God.

It may be noted that in another pictorial sonnet of Lope, *Ardese Troya*

... :

Crece el incendio propio al fuego extraño,  
Las enpinadas máquinas cayendo,  
De que se ven ruinas y pedazos,  
Y la dura ocasión de tanto daño,  
Mientras vencido París muere ardiendo,  
Del griego vencedor duerme en los brazos

there is also offered to the spiritual eye a two-tiered "moral spectacle," though this time an ironic "spectacle": Troy in flames (a mighty spectacle ["se ven ruinas y pedazos"]) that feasts the eyes of the exultant Juno ["Alegre Juno mira el fuego y llanto"]), and Helen once more in the bed of Menelaos, the conjunction 'and' enforcing the irony. (And similarly the ironic *y* in the last tercet of the pictorial sonnet *Atada al mar Andró-*

us of the original organicity of the now *desjecta membra*. It is indeed the thunderbolt of a wrathful God that has sundered the body and has reduced the torso to an 'espectáculo inhumano' and the head to a trophy, an emblem. Walter Benjamin in his book *Der Ursprung des deutschen Trauerspiels* (Berlin 1928) has convincingly demonstrated the typical rôle of the "cadaver as emblem" in baroque poetry. He quotes from a baroque treatise on emblems (*Acta eruditorum*, Leipzig 1683) the characteristic sentence:

*Integrum humanum corpus symbolicam iconem ingredi non posse, partem tamen corporis ei constituendae non esse ineptam*

and mentions many German baroque poems containing macabre *blasons*, describing, that is, in tedious detail the parts of the dead body, as well as dramas of the same period in which a severed head is tendered on a platter to a victorious tyrant seated at table ("ein Schaugericht in einer Totenmahlzeit," for example in baroque plays of Gryphius, Hallmann, etc.). The frequent representation in baroque literature of the destruction inflicted by mayhem upon the

*meda lloraba* . . . serves to connect with the tribute payed to Andrómeda's beauty by dew, sea, sun and wind the hatred and envy felt by the Nereids who wish her death.)

It has perhaps not been remarked of Hérédia's "Trophées" that in many of these sonnets the connective 'and' is used, quite in the manner of Lope, to introduce a final cadence whose note of calm decrescendo is in ironic contrast to the surging movement which precedes: ("La Trebbia")

L'aube d'un jour sinistre a blanchi les hauteurs.  
Le camp s'éveille. En bas roule et gronde le fleuve  
Où l'escadron léger des Numides s'abreuve.  
Partout sonne l'appel clair des buccinateurs . . .  
Rougeant le ciel noir de flamboiements lugubres,  
À l'horizon, brûlaient les villages Insubres;  
On entendait au loin barrir un éléphant.  
*Et là bas*, sous le pont adossé contre une arche,  
Hannibal écoutait, pensif et triomphant,  
Le piétinement sourd des légions en marche.

("Antoine et Cléopâtre")

. . . Tournant sa tête pâle entre ses cheveux bruns  
Vers celui qu' enivraient d'invincibles parfums  
Elle tendit sa bouche et ses prunelles claires;  
*Et sur elle courbé*, l'ardent Imperator  
Vit dans ses larges yeux étoilés de points d'or  
Toute une mer immense où fuyaient des galères.

human body is, in Benjamin's view, but another reflection of what he calls "allegorical fragmentation" according to which every part of the body could be made to signify allegorically the mortality of man:

Die Allegorisierung der Physis kann nur an der Leiche sich energisch durchsetzen. Und die Personen des Trauerspiels sterben, weil sie nur so, als Leichen, in die allegorische Heimat eingehen. . . . Produktion der Leiche ist, vom Tode her betrachtet, das Leben.

The story of Judith and Holophernes allowed the baroque poet to indulge in that macabre *blason* or emblem poetry in which a part of the body is allowed to die a separate death and thus to announce a *memento mori* symbolic of the whole of man's fate. The repetition of the motif of the severed head of Holophernes in medieval representations was a device of quantitative didactic insistence on the lesson *memento mori*, in Lope's baroque poem the isolation of torso and head serves to emphasize the fact of dismemberment itself, a symbol, as it were, of death twice visited upon the mortal body.

The interior of the tent where the torso lies has all the markings of death, of "frozen" attitudes, of rigor mortis (*hielo*): the whole actual scene of the beheading, with the bodily and psychic reactions of the victim, can be reconstructed from the static "inhuman spectacle" that Lope displays before us as though he were describing an existing painting: the right shoulder of Holophernes hanging down from the bed, the left hand grasping in agony (*con el ansia*) the canopy of the tent, the stains of wine on his armor, the glasses and the table that he had overthrown in his fall. To all these pictorial details of destruction (to the red and the livid)<sup>7</sup> is op-

<sup>7</sup> God's punishment is indeed alluded to various times in the lower picture: l. 3 *opuesto al muro de Betulia en vano*; l. 4 *despidió contra sí rayos del cielo* (the motif of Jupiter's thunderbolt combined with the passage *Judith* 16, 21: *Dabit enim ignem et vermes in carnes eorum, ut urantur . . .*), l. 11 *Duermen las guardas que tan mal emplea*—a detail whose iconographic origin I am not able to determine: in *Judith* 13, 1-2 we learn that the guards had rushed to their lodgings "fatigati a vino [eratque Judith sola in cubiculo]," but whose meaning is clear: the tyrant who corrupts his servants by his own debauchery has foolishly (*mal*) deprived himself of all means of protection.—God could be said to be the "painter" of the "moral spectacle" described by Lope as though it were a painting. Lope's *Deus pictor* is thus different from the painter-God of Calderón, with whom the 'painter' is the creator, the Maker of the Universe.

posed the "resplendent" figure of Judith who holds as trophy of her triumph the head that once belonged to the body in the tent. The vertical arrangement of the two scenes, the scene of the triumph taking place above that of the decapitation (while the medieval sequence developed horizontally, even if more than one tier was necessary for the complete unfolding of the pictorial narrative), corresponds to the superiority of the divine plane (the plane of Judith triumphans) over the infrahuman plane (that of Holofernes smitten) and must have appealed to the hierarchic spirit of the Counterreformation—as it was in harmony with the spirit of edification of that period that the reader, proceeding in time, should reach the higher plane of God's will only after having been forced to witness the spectacle of man's destruction on the lower plane. And it is also characteristic of the religious art of this period that it contains cruelty, as may be seen from the paintings of Magnasco and Rubens (cf. Werner Weisbach, *Die Kunst des Barock*, 1924). The cruelty displayed in those hagiographic paintings is, it is true, rather directed against the Christian martyrs in order that they may be offered opportunities for heroism, while in Lope's sonnet the cruelty is perpetrated against an enemy of God and motivated by his wrath. This cruelty is explicitly mentioned and judged by Lope in his expression "espectaculo inhumano": that the inhuman tyrant has been subjected to the *lex talionis*—this 'spectacle' must be exposed to the eyes of the believer; it is this desire to make out of the edifying story a spectacle for the moral eye<sup>8</sup> that has led the poet to describe the story as though it were a painting (in the present tense).<sup>9</sup> It may then be assumed at this point that although Lope may have been familiar with the whole iconographic tradition of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, he still has not copied any

<sup>8</sup> It is perhaps possible that Lope wished us to see as beautiful even the necessarily hideous scene of the torso (notice the detail of the red canopy), that the colors displayed should be accepted by us as pure pictorial *valeurs* as in many a painting of Rubens or in modern art. The predominance of the moral epithets in our sonnet, however, and also the explicit use of the verb *afea* seem unfavorable to that assumption.

<sup>9</sup> This pictorial present is different from the historical present which implies an intensification of narrative verve in the narrator while he is telling his story (therefore the historical present occurs often in the course of a longer narrative). On the contrary the present in our poem describes not events, but pictures that result from events and have been from the beginning in full view of the reader.

already existing painting, but has rather given his own pictorial rendering of the "spectacle" of God's wrath (and triumph), as it actually happened: it is a picture, not of a picture, but of an event.

This antithetic "picture" of lechery and chastity, ugliness and beauty, heathendom and monotheism, tyranny and freedom, a representation which satisfies equally the corporeal and the moral eye and releases dramatically the tension that exists between the two sets of principles, represents ultimately no encroachment of *pictura* upon *poesis* in the vein of ancient *ἔκφρασις* or of what the 19th century French Parnassian poet Théophile Gautier, himself under Greek influence, will call "transposition d'art."

At this point it may be fitting to oppose to our 17th century sonnet the 19th century poem in the collection "Fleurs du mal" offered by Baudelaire (legitimately or not) as an *ἔκφρασις*,<sup>10</sup> with the title *Une martyre, dessin d'un maître inconnu*, in which we hear the voice of the poet as he meditates over the grim spectacle of a beautiful body of a young woman whose head has been severed from the torso. Here there is total absence of the hierarchic (moral) values which give dimension to Lope's sonnet: here is only represented the figure of vice which is, however, endowed with the beauty once reserved for virtue.

..... un amour ténébreux,  
Une coupable joie et des fêtes étranges,  
Pleines de baisers infernaux,  
Dont se réjouissait l'essaim des mauvais anges  
Nageant dans les plis des rideaux . . .

(one may remember that in contrast in one of Rubens' representations of Judith there were depicted angels hovering over her head as auxiliary forces)

Réponds, cadavre impur! et par tes tresses roides  
Te soulevant d'un bras fiévreux,  
Dis-moi, tête effrayante, a-t-il sur tes dents froides  
Collé les suprêmes adieux?

Body and head are here seen as two separate entities, each endowed

<sup>10</sup> J.-D. Hubert in his excellent book "L'esthétique de Baudelaire" (Geneva 1953), p. 51, points out that "*Une Martyre* n'est que le dessin, réel ou imaginaire, d'un maître inconnu; néanmoins le poète écrit comme si le décollage de la belle avait vraiment eu lieu." One could say the opposite of Lope's treatment of the subject: he writes of Judith as though he described a painting (cf. note 7).



with a ghastly life of its own, seeming to have acquired after the act of severance a compensatory completeness. It is as if the head had even acquired new organs as the braids of the woman's hair transform themselves into arms (*et par les tresses roides te soulevant d'un bras févreux*), testifying to its own beauty. This multiplication of physical form could come about precisely because of the absence of the moral element: this murder was no moral deed, no realization of divine retribution (nor the murdered young woman guiltless). It is the assassin, absent from our picture, who has sinned by slaying beauty (even though impure beauty) and consolation is offered to the remains of the martyr of beauty who will enjoy the immortality due to all martyrs. For form that cannot be destroyed by mutilation will survive matter ("ta forme immortelle"): the vision of the beauty that he killed will for ever haunt the memory of the murdered. Such a glorification of physical form and of the indestructible ideality of the beautiful body in which there is no vestige of a moral superstructure would have been impossible in the age of Lope.

LEO SPITZER

---

#### SOVIET RUSSIA THROUGH THE EYES OF ZWEIG AND ROLLAND

Romain Rolland's friend and ally, both during the lonely years of World War I and during his bitter struggle against fascism and national socialism later, was that other great cosmopolitan spirit of our time, Stefan Zweig, a man and artist with whom Rolland had always felt profound personal affinities because of his tireless efforts to further international understanding through his work as a literary mediator.

The Great War of 1914 was a rude awakening for both Rolland and Zweig from their dreams of international peace. In the first days of the war Rolland was darkly despondent, for it seemed to him at that moment as though all of his hopes and efforts of the Christophe years had been in vain. In Rolland, however, such feelings of despair generally lasted only until a new course of action had become clear; and the war was not long in indicating both an immediate one, the active defense of his humanitarian

beliefs, and a long term one which he was to follow until his death in 1944. As early as 1915 Rolland writes that he will not only continue to pursue his campaign against war and hatred but that he will embark on a new campaign as well against the great evil underlying the world's recent conflicts, capitalism.<sup>1</sup>

It was Rolland's firm conviction concerning the evils of capitalism which led him, in spite of his belief in gradual social change, to hail the Russian Revolution in 1917 as heralding the advent of a new social order for all mankind.<sup>2</sup> Even while greeting the Russian Revolution with enthusiasm, however, Rolland warned its leaders of the dangers facing it:

Que votre révolution soit celle d'un grand peuple, sain, fraternel, humain, évitant les excès où nous sommes tombés! Surtout restez unis! Que notre exemple vous éclaire! Souvenez-vous de la Convention française, comme Saturne dévorant ses enfants! Soyez plus tolérants que nous ne l'avons été! <sup>3</sup>

In Rolland's defense of Russia at the time of the economic blockade in 1919 we hear once again the same admonishing tone. In 1919 it was chiefly Russia's harsh treatment of her intellectuals which Rolland censured. The success of a revolution depends, he argued, on the cooperation of workers and intellectuals; hence it is indispensable that differences between them be carefully ironed out. In the construction of the great edifice of the new Russia the two groups would work side by side, he hoped, just as in the Middle Ages workers and artisans labored side by side to build the great cathedrals. He staunchly refused to subscribe to the view held by Henri Barbusse and other ardent Russian sympathizers in France that the intellectuals should entirely surrender their independence of thought and become mere tools of the revolution.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> R. Rolland, "Au-dessus de la mêlée," in the collection, *Au-dessus de la mêlée*, Paris, 1915, p. 32.

<sup>2</sup> Rolland addressed an open letter to "la Russie libre et libératrice" which appeared in the Genevan review, *Demain*, in the issue of May 1, 1917. The letter was later reprinted in the collection, *Les Précurseurs*, Paris, 1920, pp. 39-40.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> In reply to one of Barbusse's articles in *Clarté*, December 1922, Rolland published an open letter in the Belgian review, *L'art libre*, challenging Barbusse's contention that the ends always justify the means in revolutions. The letter is included in the prologue to *I will not rest*, p. 23.

Rolland expresses in very enthusiastic terms his hopes for the new Russia in a letter to his friend Zweig under date of February 24, 1920. In Russia, he tells Zweig, one finds the men who will prove that humanity is still capable of great things:

Les hommes attendus par vous qui montreront la grandeur nouvelle de l'humanité existent. Ils sont en Russie. Nous les entendrons bientôt. Je jouis de savoir que le soleil se lève de nouveau là-bas.<sup>5</sup>

In later letters, however, Rolland brings forth once again the objections against Russia which he had raised in the controversy with Barbusse. Writing to Zweig on December 11, 1922, for example, he remarks that he is alarmed at the suppression of individual liberty in the new Soviet state. Rolland's strong feelings on the necessity of preserving intellectual and spiritual freedom finally led him to write in 1922 that the great problem of our time is to "find a harmony in which the legitimate exigencies of the socio-economic revolution and those not less legitimate of spiritual liberty are reconciled."<sup>6</sup> The quest for this harmony was to occupy Rolland for many years to come. Russia was, to be sure, not always in the foreground in his mind during these years, for much of his energy and thought were concentrated on organizing the great struggle against fascism and national socialism which emerged in the twenties and early thirties as the new and deadlier reincarnation of his old arch-enemy, nationalism. He was nevertheless ever vigilant during those years and never failed to lash out boldly whenever he felt that Russia was in danger.

Zweig, on the other hand, though disposed to be friendly toward Russia, particularly after his visit in 1938, was never able to overcome certain basic objections on humanistic grounds and thus always remained more reserved in attitude than his French friend. Rolland found that his readings in Marx helped him to overcome many of his reservations, for, as he tells us in the prologue of his *I will not rest*, Marx "tore away the illusions we in the bourgeois states allow ourselves to be wrapped in and thus ruthlessly laid bare the bourgeois ideology."<sup>7</sup> Citing from *Zur Judenfrage*,

<sup>5</sup> From the unpublished correspondence between Zweig and Rolland in the archives of the *Association des Amis de Romain Rolland* in Paris.

<sup>6</sup> R. Rolland, *I will not rest*, Prologue, p. 32.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

Rolland points out that in Marx' view the much vaunted liberty of the bourgeois state is a limited freedom in actual fact, since it implies only the right to do anything which does not infringe on the rights of others. This view of liberty, as the limits within which one is free to move, causes each man to see in every other man a limitation of his liberty, Marx maintains, and it has had the result of making man in bourgeois society a fundamentally unsocial being, an "abstract citizen." By transforming the abstract citizen into a social being, communism, Marx argues, restores man to his full humanity; and he derives from this argument the conclusion that communism may thus be truly said to coincide with the humanistic ideal of the past.<sup>8</sup> Rolland's resistance to the communist ideology was all but broken by this assurance that communism as a way of life is completely compatible with the vision of social harmony and international brotherhood which he shared with his idols, Goethe, Schiller, and Beethoven.

During the period of his orientation towards Russia, Rolland's banner, he informs us in his *Compagnons de route*, was Goethe's phrase, "*Das Ideelle sei im Reellen anzuerkennen.*"<sup>9</sup> It is not surprising that Rolland should choose a motto in which both real and ideal are represented, for in seeking a positive course of social action—and that was the goal of his striving from 1914 on—he never abandoned the idealistic outlook of his youth. What he always hoped to find was a synthesis of real and ideal. His models were Shakespeare and Goethe, both of whom, he believed, had been singularly successful in striking the proper balance between real and ideal in their art. Shakespeare achieved this equilibrium by dominating life and its passions, Rolland found, whereas Goethe achieved it by identifying himself with life. Goethe could not share Shakespeare's essentially static world-view, Rolland declares, for he and his age had made the discovery that the essence of life is eternal change, eternal becoming, "*le Devenir éternel.*" Rolland connects this concept of the "*Devenir éternel*" in a very interesting fashion with the revolutionary upheavals of recent times. Even during Goethe's lifetime, Rolland maintains, the concept of "*Devenir éternel*" was formulated into a dialectic system by Hegel. Almost immediately afterward it was taken up by the

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> R. Rolland, *Compagnons de route*, introduction, p. 12.

young Hegelian, Marx, and given a social application. Thus we may say, Rolland concludes, that Goethe unwittingly prepared the way for Lenin and the Russian revolution!<sup>10</sup>

It was Rolland's ardent wish to identify himself with the spirit of his age as Goethe and Lenin had done, and he felt that he was making great strides in this direction by turning to the support of Russia in the thirties. Even his final acceptance of Russia, however, was to a large extent dependent on the assurance that the human values in which he believed were beginning to come into their own there. If Zweig had carried out his intention of preparing an up-to-date version of his Rolland biography, he would have had to devote considerable attention to his friend's later intellectual and political development, particularly his orientation towards Soviet Russia. The two writers, as mentioned above, did not see eye to eye on the Russian question, and the divergence of their views becomes increasingly apparent in their correspondence during the thirties. In July, 1935, Rolland accepted Maxim Gorky's invitation to Moscow and was honored during his visit by receiving from Stalin the title of Citizen of Moscow. Later that summer, in a letter dated August 18, Zweig, in reply to Rolland's enthusiastic account of his visit, warned his friend not to be carried away by the warmth of the reception accorded him. He, too, had been impressed by the "*chaleur humaine*" of the people during his visit to Russia in 1928; however, he expresses the fear that the wonderful *élan* which both he and Rolland experienced in Russia is somehow akin to the uncritical enthusiasm which has fired the youth of Italy and Germany as well.<sup>11</sup>

Zweig's general abhorrence of political polemics and his reluctance to generalize after his brief contact with Russia led him in his account of his Russian trip to limit himself to an appreciation of the Soviet state's cultural achievements. Politically active as he was, Rolland was never able to understand Zweig's aversion to active participation in politics and criticized this attitude in his friend from time to time. For us today, Rolland wrote to Zweig

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 15.

<sup>11</sup> "Ne me croyez pas insensible à cette concentration de forces vivantes du peuple, mais je ne veux pas, non, je ne veux pas oublier 'le grand danger de cette dispersion de la propre volonté dans la masse.' J'aime encore et toujours les isolés, qui ont combattu pour les grandes idées, mais en refusant de se mettre en rang et en uniforme." (August 13, 1935).



in March, 1933, ". . . le point essentiel n'est pas 'violence, ou non-violence,' il est: 'agir!' . . . La pire défaite, la seule défaite est celle qui vient, non de l'ennemi, mais de soi." Zweig always admired Rolland's militant attitude and shared fully both his hatred of fascism and his sympathy for Russia; yet he appears never to have felt tempted to follow his friend into the political arena.

The sharply diverging views of Zweig and Rolland on Soviet Russia came closest to causing friction between the two friends in the exchange of letters concerning André Gide's book, *Retour de L'U. R. S. S.* In a letter to Rolland from London (December 5, 1936) Zweig expresses his favorable reaction to the work and states once again that he has never accepted the new Russia "en bloc" as Rolland seems to have done. One senses sharp irritation in Rolland's reply four days later, Far from sharing Zweig's enthusiasm, Rolland finds Gide's work "affligeant":

Ce n'est pas tant que son acte soit, à l'heure actuelle, une mauvaise action, dont il savait mieux que quiconque que profiteraient tous les chiens enragés des fascismes et de la réaction. Mais le tout: griffes et caresses, est à fleur de peau,—d'une superficialité ridicule,—le type des impressions des gendelettres—(fut-il jamais, d'ailleurs, autre chose?)—Il n'a rien vu, rien cherché à voir à fond. Et l'on sent trop, dans ses petites méchancetés, la petite vengeance d'un littérateur froissé dans sa petite vanité, par l'accueil distant que lui ont fait les chefs—(Ils n'avaient pas tort!)

Rolland refuses even to discuss Gide's work (his "opuscule," as he calls it!) but promises that at some future time he will write what he thinks of Soviet Russia "d'après ce que j'ai vu, entendu, lu, appris, et réfléchi." We can only regret that he never found time to carry out this promise.

Although Rolland and Zweig never came to see eye to eye on the issue of Soviet Russia, their differences in outlook never led to an estrangement. For although Rolland would have been happy to have his friend share his views, he never resented the fact that Zweig was unable to overcome his basic doubts and reservations. Zweig himself has best summed up these latter in his letter of September 27, 1937:

Je vous répète, et je vous répéterai toujours—je ne sais pas ce qui se passe en U. R. S. S., je ne sais pas le russe, je n'ai pas d'impressions personnelles—je ne vois que les effets dans la constellation universelle, et ce sont les effets qui m'effraient.

Even in this letter, however, he makes it clear that he is not opposed to Russia herself but to what has been happening there as far as individual liberty is concerned.

International understanding and universal peace continued to be the ideal goals of Romain Rolland and Stefan Zweig in the last years of their lives just as they had been during the years of World War I. Rolland, however, became more and more militant in his championing of these ideals. His new battle cry in the last years was the ringing phrase, "Par la Révolution, la Paix!". The revolution which he championed, however, was no mere political upheaval such as the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution had been. It was, he tells us in *Compagnons de route* (p. 20), that permanent revolution, "qui monte à l'assaut éternel du destin, et par la force lui ravit, jour après jour, un lambeau de plus de la vérité." These stirring lines express the quality which was the very core of Rolland's being—his dynamism. It was this quality which he admired most in others, including his friend Zweig, and he wrote always, he tells us in the "epilogue" of his *I will not rest*, for those who are "on the move." Life for him was nothing if not movement, and what he admired most in Russia in the years before World War II was the fact that she seemed to be giving an impulse forward toward the goal which he so cherished of a human community in which frontiers and classes no longer would exist, in which the communist ideal would be realized in the ideal Marxian sense. This was the belief which he sought to instill in his friend Zweig; and it was as an ardent adherent of this belief, not as a fellow traveller, that Rolland supported Russia until his death in 1944. To argue that he accepted the Moscow line uncritically and wholeheartedly is to fail to understand Rolland's nature as man and artist. As Madame Rolland says of him, he was not an "idéologue"; his mind was too flexible, his range of interests too wide ever to allow him to become a partisan of an "idée fixe" or of any system whatsoever. If he supported Russia to the last, it was because he continued to look upon her as part of the "vanguard of humanity's great marching army," as one of the leaders of humanity in its endless march forward.

WILLIAM H. MCCLAIN

*The Johns Hopkins University*

FIVE FUGITIVE PIECES OF FIFTEENTH-CENTURY  
SECULAR VERSE

These five poems are part of the unpublished remains of late Middle English secular verse; like most of the fugitive verse of the period, they are anonymous, and they exist in unique copies scribbled on blank spaces in older MSS. Bibliography can tell us something of the histories of the MSS, but it can supply us with precious little information about authorship; there is no internal evidence in the poems themselves. Intrinsically these pieces are worth whatever conventional occasional verse of any epoch may be worth. Historically their value lies in the additional evidence they give us about the kind and extent of the secular tradition in fifteenth-century English verse. These particular pieces are also noteworthy for brevity. Three and possibly four of these stanzas are lyric; the fifth is didactic. The subject in each instance is love. Metrically they offer further evidence of the popularity of the rime royal stanza; four of the five are in rime royal. The fifth is a quatrain of octosyllabic couplets in iambic tetrameter, interesting for a skillful variation of meter in the first and last lines.

"Come, Death" is a single rime royal stanza copied by an unknown hand at the end of MS Pembroke College Cambridge 307.<sup>1</sup> It is a conventional plea to Death, an apostrophe to a personified abstraction, reflecting the usual gloom of the love-sick speaker whose mistress is cruel. The device is simple: Death, once feared, is now welcome, since the speaker's lady wills his death.

<sup>1</sup> MS 307 is in vellum, 15½ x 10½ in., fols. 200 plus 2, in double columns. M. R. James, who gives a complete description of the MS and its contents in *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Pembroke College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1905), dates the MS early fifteenth century. It consists principally of a copy of Gower's *Confessio Amantis*. For permission to publish the text of "Come, Death," I am grateful to the Master and Fellows of Pembroke College. I have seen this and the texts of "Thanks, Gentle Fortune" and "Where I Love" in the microfilm collection made by the British Manuscripts Project of the American Council of Learned Societies. I used the prints of the collection which are deposited in the General Library of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Come, Death<sup>2</sup>

O Dethe, whylum dysplesant to nature, [fol. 198r, col. I]  
 Where duellyst þow? Wylte thou þinn man forsake?<sup>3</sup>  
 Come on and se thow wofull creature  
 That haþe his herte vnto a lady take,  
 That woll his deþe and lyst no pese to make. 5  
 Cum and helpe the petuys mane to ende.  
 In the lythe all; here ys non odere ffrende.

The cheerful tone of "Thanks, Gentle Fortune" makes an interesting contrast with the despair expressed in "Come, Death," but in its way the rime royal stanza to Fortune is just as conventional as the one to Death. Its chief virtue is a felicitous use of the traditional phraseology and diction in a completely conventional apostrophe to a personified abstraction. The only unusual quality exhibited here is the rather neat and economical use of the apostrophe for an obviously different purpose than that stated directly. Actually the poem fits the convention as well in its praise of the lady as it does in the apostrophe to Fortune, who, for a change, is thanked instead of berated. The poem is from MS Trinity College Cambridge 652.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> I have supplied the title. This poem is No. 2412 in Carleton Brown and Rossell H. Robbins, *The Index of Middle English Verse* (New York, 1943). It is copied once in ink and twice more on the same page in a faded scrawl which may not be ink, one of these latter versions being of normal size and the other of enormous letters spread across the tops of both facing pages of the MS. The text presented here is that of the clear ink copy, which is in a hand probably later than the rest of the MS. This hand employs a single character, a *y*, to stand for both *y* and *þ*, and I have chosen arbitrarily the letter to be transcribed. Alternate readings are given in the textual notes when necessary.

In transcribing the texts of this and the other poems presented here, I have retained MS spelling, using italics for expansions of abbreviations and contractions. I have supplied punctuation and capitalization for the convenience of the reader. I have made no emendations.

<sup>3</sup> Textual note: alternate readings in this line: ?yow; ?yinn.

<sup>4</sup> MS 652 is shelfmarked R. 4. 20 [579], and it is described by M. R. James (*The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge* [Cambridge, 1900-1901], II. 147-149) as "Cent. XV early." It is vellum, measuring 10½ x 7½ in., fols. 172. Professor R. L. Greene describes the MS and gives some information on the date in *The Early English Carols* (Oxford 1935), p. 344. Actually there are four separate parts of the MS, as follows: 1) *The Travels of Sir John Mandeville*, be-

Thanks, Gentle Fortune <sup>5</sup>

O gentyll Fortune, I thonke yowe i-wys [fol. 170r]  
 That yhe me lyste haue preferre so,  
 To luf hyr beste that fayreste is,  
 Ande of godely the godelyeste also.  
 Ande for to speke of other vertus mo: 5  
 She hath ynowe ande is well famede,  
 Of ryght gode altherbeste y-namede!

A favorite late Middle English poetic device was the acrostic. MS Trinity College Cambridge 257<sup>6</sup> contains an unpublished acrostic addressed to *Katyryn*. This little *tour de force* is a single rime royal stanza which emphasizes the acrostic by separating the initial letters from the rest of the lines. So conventional is the expression of the vow of service that this poem could be considered either secular or religious. Since it is a late addition to the MS, however, and since it contains so much of the familiar phraseology of the lover's vow, it seems highly probable that it is addressed to a living lady, not to a saint.

fore 1450; 2) an English love letter in one complete copy and several partial copies, before 1600; 3) Lydgate's *Siege of Thebes*, before 1450; 4) English poems, before 1450. These last items, "Thanks, Gentle Fortune" among them, are in a hand later than that of the Lydgate poem. I am grateful to Professor Hans Kurath, editor, and to the staff of the Middle English Dictionary being compiled at the University of Michigan, for the information from their files on the dates of the parts of the MS. For permission to publish this poem and *Katyryn* and "Where I Love," I am grateful to the Master and Fellows and to the Librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge.

<sup>5</sup> I have supplied the title. This poem is No. 2440 in Brown and Robbins' *Index*. It begins at the top of fol. 170r. Below the last line there are some miscellaneous lines, followed by a copy of the first line of the poem, scrawled in a different hand, as follows: "O gentell fortune I thanke yowe."

<sup>6</sup> MS 257 is shelfmarked B. 11. 18 [465]. The MS is vellum, 7 $\frac{3}{8}$  x 5 $\frac{3}{8}$  in., fols. 114 plus 6. It is illuminated. It contains a collection of Latin and English prose and verse, mainly religious. There is a complete description of the MS and its contents in James' Trinity catalogue, I. 359-360. James suggests a date of ca. 1440 for the MS. I have seen the text in negative photostatic copy.



Katyryn <sup>7</sup>

K avser of my goy, helthe, *and* comforde, [fol. 1<sup>v</sup>]  
 A wille es in yov, my hartis lady dere.  
 T reule as ye best, ryght so y me reporte,  
 Y oure servond to be day tyme and ere,  
 R yght as ye well; bot thes y yov rekere 5  
 Y n way of servyse, as lovle as y cane:  
 N euire to change, bot take me for your man.

A cynically practical view of love is expressed in "Advice to Lovers," a rime royal stanza from MS Royal 18. A. vi.<sup>8</sup> There is a direct personal application in the second line, wherein we learn that Jeame, poor fellow, has none of the qualities so necessary for success in love. As a kind of *caveat* for would-be lovers, the message of the poem has a timeless accuracy by no means limited to "courtly" tradition. There is an air of cold disenchantment about the whole stanza, emphasized strongly in the final lines: those who would be lovers must have one of these three qualities; the implication is clear, however, that while all three are desirable, any one will be quite sufficient. So much for women's meticulous standard of perfection in men!

<sup>7</sup> I have supplied the title. The hand is cursive, later than that which wrote the rest of the MS, according to James (see note 6 above). The acrostic is No. 588 in Brown and Robbins, but it is on fol. 1<sup>v</sup>, not on the flyleaf as the *Index* states. The poem occupies the center of the page, which is blank except for this piece and two lines of the preceding Latin text at the top. The acrostic appears to bear no relation to the rest of the MS, and it was almost certainly added after the MS was written.

<sup>8</sup> This MS, from the Royal Collection in the British Museum, is paper and vellum, two sizes (8¾ x 6¼ in. and 5¾ x 4 in.) bound together; fols. 103. It is a collection of medical treatises, herbals, recipes for medicines, and other related texts. "Advice to Lovers" seems to be unrelated to the rest of the MS, except perhaps in the practical nature of its message. According to the catalogue (G. F. Warner and J. P. Gilson, *British Museum Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King's Collections* [London, 1921], II. 264), the contents vary in date from ca. 1400 to the late fifteenth century. I have seen a photostatic copy of only one page, and therefore I can comment only on the hand of this poem, which in my judgment is late fifteenth century, cursive. For permission to publish this poem, I am grateful to the Keeper of Manuscripts of the British Museum and to Mr. T. J. Brown, Assistant Keeper of Manuscripts.

Advice to Lovers<sup>9</sup>

He that wil be a lover in euery wise, [fol. 22r]  
 He muste haue thre thingis whiche Jeame lackith:<sup>10</sup>  
 The first is goodlyhede at poynt devise;  
 The secunde is manere which manhoode makith;  
 The thryd is goode þat no woman hatith. 5  
 Marke wel this: þat lovers wil be  
 Must nedys haue oone of thes thre!

"Where I Love," from MS Trinity Cambridge 263,<sup>11</sup> employs a kind of incremental repetition to express a fine distinction between lust and love. The key word is *rage* (v. 3), which is probably to be taken in the sense of "to behave wantonly or riotously (NED, v. † 3.)." The effect of the stanza is cryptic; its attempt at epigrammatic terseness conceals the meaning better than it expresses it.

Where I Love<sup>12</sup>

Wher I loue I love rigth wele, [fol 32r]  
 And where I kysse I loue some deele;  
 But where I rage I love ryghte noughte,  
 ffor where þat I love is all my þoughte!<sup>13</sup>

KENNETH G. WILSON

*University of Connecticut*

<sup>9</sup> I have supplied the title. This poem is No. 1170 in Brown and Robbins. The text appears near the top of fol. 22r, which contains several short pieces in several hands.

<sup>10</sup> Textual note: *Jeame*—The initial letter may be either an *I* or a *J*, and the three minims are undifferentiated.

<sup>11</sup> MS 263 is shelfmarked B. 11. 24 [415] and is in two parts; vellum and paper, 6½ x 4¼ in., fols. 96 plus 32. Part I contains the *Manuale Sacerdotis*, Part II some notes on Psalms i-cvii, Lydgate's *Dietary*, and some short poems, including "Where I Love." Most of the short poems are religious pieces. M. R. James, who describes the MS in his catalogue of the Trinity College MSS (I. 374-375), says the MS is fifteenth century, with Part II "in a later hand" than Part I. Carleton Brown, *A Register of Middle English Religious and Didactic Verse* (Oxford, 1916-1920), I. 235, dates Part II ca. 1450. The Middle English Dictionary (see note 4, above) will give dates of "about 1450" and "before 1500" respectively for the two parts.

<sup>12</sup> I have supplied the title. These lines appear on the last leaf of the MS, in the center of a group of miscellaneous pieces in two or three hands. "Where I Love" is No. 4060 in Brown and Robbins.

<sup>13</sup> Textual note: *love* might be read *loke*; the third letter is doubtful.

## EXPERIMENTS IN POETRY: FATHER TABB

Sidney Lanier and Emily Dickinson have recently been cited as poets who dared to experiment and who were "the heralds of the great changes impending in the poetry of America. . . . Emily Dickinson's experimentation," further declares Professor Stanley T. Williams, "in debt to Emerson, and in love with the image, the word, and learning, anticipates the metaphysical strain in the verse of today. Taken together, their [Lanier's, and Dickinson's] originality heralded afar of new themes, new forms; their verse (and Whitman's) formed the pronaos of modern poetry." In the same critical discussion Professor Williams drops a contemporary of theirs, Father Tabb, into the limbo of the poets who, like Stedman, Aldrich, Sill, and Poe, held "the unwavering conviction that the principles of verse had been fixed for good and aye, that Parnassus was closed save through the single door of the English romantic poets."<sup>1</sup>

That this judgment with reference at least to Father Tabb is unwarranted is proved by an examination of his poems, particularly those written between 1884 and 1894, which reveal him worthy of a place with Lanier and Dickinson as an experimenter. First, he was perhaps the earliest of the pre-Eliot poets to write in the metaphysical manner; and, secondly, he was obviously doing in his way what Hopkins and Dickinson were attempting—was using a special syntactical approach to achieve a form of extraordinary compression.<sup>2</sup>

His early lyric and narrative efforts, echoing Lanier, Hood, Shelley, Poe and Tennyson, and marred by thin thought, vague description, and unnecessary length, were scarcely in print before they provoked his own critical renouncement, confirmed by immediate change in practice. From 1879 to 1883 he focused his attention upon sonnets, writing three-fifths of his total of fifty-one.

<sup>1</sup> "Experiments in Poetry," *Literary History of the United States* (New York, 1948), II, 901, 916, 900.

<sup>2</sup> His work was known to the reading public before Emily Dickinson's. He did not know her poems until 1894. See *Letters, Grave and Gay, and Other Prose of John Banister Tabb*, ed. Francis E. Litz (Washington, D. C., 1950), 61-63, 94, 96.

Between 1884 and 1891 he published only three poems like his early ones and only five sonnets. During the same period, however, he published at least forty poems confined within four to twenty verses. This pattern he, like Dickinson, followed for the rest of his life.

This change in external patterns was accompanied by important structural changes: fewer similes but more metaphors, fewer direct but more oblique statements, fewer images and phrases in series by way of rhetorical repetition and parallelism. His imagery became more and more functional; his structures, more and more compact. One aspect of this development, which is apparent in many poems, long ago drew the comment of the English editor and critic, Harold J. Massingham. He championed Father Tabb as a successful Imagist<sup>3</sup> before T. E. Hulme set the genre and Ezra Pound invented the term.

With these new elements came a different poetry—the kind Donne, Herbert, and Crashaw had introduced, the kind that Emily Dickinson was writing and keeping to herself, and the kind that has won the approval of our contemporaries. His finer poems are designed wholes and often the conceit is the structure; they are perfect units of acute sensibility. As to sense structure, they are essentially analytic and achieved through conceit, antithesis, paradox, hyperbole, oxymoron, and paranomasia; but as to sound structure, they are rather of the Romantic and Victorian periods than of the seventeenth-century school.<sup>4</sup>

The union of the commonplace with the unusual, the trivial with the significant, the ugly with the beautiful, which enables the poet to combine several levels of thought and to direct attention forcefully to the one of his own choice by the very incongruity of the juxtaposition, is notably realized in many of Father Tabb's poems.

<sup>3</sup> "An Image-Maker," *Letters to X* (London, 1919), 270-277.

<sup>4</sup> The following are some examples: "St Afra to the Flames" (*Independent*, Aug. 26, 1886); "A Lenten Thought" (*Independent*, March 8, 1888); "The Chord" (*Independent*, May 3, 1888); "Father Damien" (*Independent*, May 23, 1889); "The Recompense" (*Sunday School Times*, March 28, 1891); "Is Thy Servant a Dog?" (written Sept. 25, 1892); "The Portrait" (*Youth's Companion*, Aug. 31, 1893); "Silence" (*Cosmopolitan*, May, 1893); "My Offering" (written Sept. 27, 1894). All the poems cited or referred to are found in *The Poetry of Father Tabb* (New York, 1928). Many others of this kind were written after 1894; e.g., "Bethel" and "Beatitude."

Examples, of course, abound in the work of Donne and Dickinson. How unprepared critics were in 1895 to recognize—what we now accept—the artistry of this manner, can easily be gauged from the reception accorded

Out of Bounds

A little boy of heavenly birth,  
But far from home today,  
Comes down to find His ball, the earth,  
That sin has cast away.  
O comrades, let us one and all  
Join in to get Him back his ball.<sup>6</sup>

Probably from the pen of Jeannette Gilder came this unqualified condemnation: "He seems almost to have lost the faculty of distinguishing the true from the false, the sphere of faith from that of fancy. This state of mind . . . fairly burlesques itself in the preposterous conceit, flippantly entitled "Out of Bounds." For sheer buffoonery no medieval friar could have beaten that."<sup>6</sup>

In all of these poems, it is evident, Father Tabb was continuously cultivating verbal economy; he was reducing his utterance to the barest skeleton of language. But he went further. The deviations from syntactical norms by his contemporaries Dickinson and Whitman are known and recognized. They are present in Tabb, but no one has yet even pointed them out or seen their significance, not only in relation to the metaphysical aspect of his composition, but also in themselves as anticipating our present practice. He often did away with subject and principal verb, principal verb, subject and auxiliary verb, conjunction, relative pronoun, and put the burden of carrying the meaning on noun, adjective, phrase and subordinate clause. The chief reason for this paring to the syntactical bone was his consuming passion to express only the essence of his poetic experiences and to embody them in the tightest of speech constructs.

One of the earliest examples of the omission of subject and principal verb is "Fancy," published in the *Independent*, October 31, 1889.<sup>7</sup> A variation occurs in the use of a predicate adjective instead

<sup>6</sup> Written Dec. 24, 1893.

<sup>6</sup> *The Critic*, Sept. 7, 1895. See *Letters*, Nos. 104 and 140, as well as the notes to them.

<sup>7</sup> See also "December" (*Youth's Companion*, Dec. 25, 1890); "Poetry" (written July 9–Aug. 26, 1892); "The Immaculate Conception" (written Jan. 27, 1894).

of a predicate noun, as in "The Christmas Babe," which is structured as a contrast and a paradox:

So *small* that lesser lowliness  
Must bow to worship or caress;  
So *great* that heaven itself to know  
Love's majesty must look below.<sup>8</sup>

Some poems omit all verbs; one of the best illustrations is also his most anthologized poem:

Evolution  
Out of the dusk a shadow,  
Then a spark;  
Out of the cloud a silence,  
Then a lark;  
Out of the heart a rapture,  
Then a pain;  
Out of the dead, cold ashes  
Life again.<sup>9</sup>

Another often quoted quatrain notable for syntactical liberty is "The Dandelion," published in the *Youth's Companion*, July 14, 1892:

With locks of gold today;  
Tomorrow, silver gray;  
Then blossom-bald. Behold  
O man, thy fortune told!

"St. Mary of Egypt" is composed of four stanzas, of which the first, third, and fourth have normal sentence structures, but the second only a series of elliptical verses.<sup>10</sup> This same elliptical structure aptly imparts to the opening lines of "Shell Tints" a colloquial tone, which is continued to the last stanza.<sup>11</sup> The conversational touch is present in "Leaf and Soul," which offers another pattern—the omission of subject and auxiliary verb.<sup>12</sup> The

<sup>8</sup> Written Jan. 1894. See also "Milton" (*Atlantic Monthly*, Dec. 1885); "Better" (written Sept. 28, 1892).

<sup>9</sup> *Poems* (1894).

<sup>10</sup> *Independent*, Jan. 19, 1882. See especially two sonnets—"Unmoored" (written before 1882) and "Unuttered" (*Harper's*, June 1883); "Joy" (*Independent*, Oct. 31, 1889); "The Jewess" (*Sunday School Times*), March 7, 1891; "The Strangers" (*Harper's Young People*, Jan. 13, 1891); "Blossom" (*Cosmopolitan*, Dec. 1892).

<sup>11</sup> *Independent*, Jan. 31, 1889.

<sup>12</sup> *Sunday School Times*, Nov. 15, 1902.



subject is omitted in "Anonymous."<sup>13</sup> There is design in Tabb's employment of fragmentary sentences and prepositional and participial phrases. They may serve, at the beginning or at the end or in the middle of his poems, as a summary of the idea or of the situation that prompts his reflections or occasions the subsequent action. "Autumn Gold" illustrates the summary at the beginning;<sup>14</sup> "Bethel" at the beginning as well as at the end;<sup>15</sup> and the fourth stanza of "My Guide" in the middle.<sup>16</sup>

Since Father Tabb was an authentic poet and a self-reliant person, he moved away from some of the restricting forces of his own times to independent expression of reality. Constantly critical he was of his own art, as his letters show, and he was always reaching beyond his present achievement. His performances before Emily Dickinson's 1890 and 1894 volumes appeared, as well as after he knew her poems, are sufficient warrant to include him among the American poets who experimented and to rank him as one of the earliest heralds of modern poetic form.

FRANCIS E. LITZ

Catholic University

---

#### NOTES CONCERNING CERTAIN POEMS BY SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE

##### 1.

Students of S. T. Coleridge have always supposed that his lines, *To Fortune*, published in the *Morning Chronicle*, November 7, 1797, represent his first appearance in print. An examination of the files of the *Morning Chronicle*, however, reveals that the schoolboy poem, *Genevieve*, was published there on July 15, 1793, under the title, *Irregular Sonnet*, with the signature "C.—Ætatis 14."

##### 2.

Two sonnets, *The Faded Flower* and *To Lord Stanhope*, which are included in *The Complete Poetical Works of Samuel Taylor*

<sup>13</sup> *Lyrics* (1897).

<sup>14</sup> Written Sept. 1892; *Independent*, Aug. 23, 1894.

<sup>15</sup> *Sunday School Times*, Nov. 18, 1899.

<sup>16</sup> *Lyrics* (1897). See also "Autumn Song" (written July 1892) and "Fugitives" (written Dec. 1893).

Coleridge, 1912, pp. 70 and 89, were probably not written by Coleridge. *The Faded Flower* was quoted by Coleridge, with no explanatory comment, in a letter to Henry Martin, dated July 22<sup>nd</sup> 1794, and was published, along with the letter, in the *New Monthly Magazine*, August 1836. Assuming the sonnet to be Coleridge's, J. D. Campbell included it in *The Poetical Works*, 1893, p. 31. The text of the sonnet as it appears in the letter to Martin reads:

The faded Flower.

Ungrateful He, who pluck'd thee from thy stalk,  
 Poor faded Flowret! on his careless way;  
 Inhaled awhile thy odours on his walk,  
 Then onward pass'd and left thee to decay.  
 Ah melancholy Emblem! had I seen  
 Thy modest Beauties dew'd with evening's Gem,  
 I had not rudely cropt thy parent stem;  
 But left thee blushing 'mid the enliven'd Green.  
 And now I bend me o'er thy wither'd Bloom,  
 And drop the tear—as Fancy at my Side  
 Deep-sighing points the fair frail Abra's Tomb,—  
 "Like thine, sad Flower! was that poor Wanderer's pride!  
 "O lost to Love & Truth! whose selfish Joy  
 "Tasted her vernal sweets—but tasted to destroy!"

Southey, however, published the sonnet in *Poems by Robert Lovell and Robert Southey*, 1795, p. 68, and it was, therefore, probably his own composition.<sup>1</sup> There is a manuscript copy of this poem, in an unknown handwriting and with the initials S. T. C., in the Pierpont Morgan Library.<sup>2</sup> It is dated July 10, 94. Coleridge never published the sonnet and Southey did not reprint it.

A sonnet, *To Lord Stanhope*, was published over the signature "One of the People" in the *Morning Chronicle*, January 31, 1795, and solely on the authority of J. D. Campbell, who discovered it in that newspaper, it has been added to the Coleridge canon.

<sup>1</sup> The following variants occur in the sonnet as published by Southey: line 1, for pluck'd read pluckt; line 3, for thy read thine; line 4, for Then onward pass'd read Then past along; line 5, for Ah read Thou; line 8 reads: But left thy blossom still to grace the green; line 11, for Abra's read *Emma's*.

<sup>2</sup> The version in the Morgan Library is the same as that in Coleridge's letter to Martin, with the following exceptions: line 11, for Abra's read *Emma's*; line 13, for Love & Truth read Nature's Charms; line 14, for her vernal read thy Virgin.

Campbell's assumption of Coleridge's authorship, however, seems incorrect. Between December 1, 1794, and January 29, 1795, Coleridge contributed eleven "Sonnets on Eminent Characters" to the *Morning Chronicle*, the first appearing with his letter of transmittal; and on March 10, 1795, he wrote to George Dyer: "I shall soon transmit to the *Morning Chronicle* 5 more Sonnets to Eminent characters—among the rest, one to Lord Stanhope." No such additional sonnets were contributed by Coleridge, and it is unlikely that he would refer specifically to a sonnet to Stanhope, if he had published one five weeks earlier, *i. e.*, January 31, 1795.

Coleridge did, however, write a sonnet, *To Earl Stanhope* ("Not, STANHOPE! with the Patriot's doubtful name"), which was first published in his *Poems* of 1796. In October of that year, when he was considering a second edition, he wrote to his publisher Cottle, that this sonnet was to be omitted; and in 1807, he said it was inserted in the first edition "without my consent . . . by the fool of a Publisher in order, forsooth, that he might send the book, and a letter, to Earl Stanhope."<sup>3</sup>

Three trifling epigrams, which appeared in the *Monthly Magazine* in April and June, 1804, have not hitherto been identified as Coleridge's. In November 1802, George Dyer began a series of articles in the *Monthly Magazine* under the title, "Cantabrigiana." In March 1804 he published the following anecdote: "The poetical abilities of Mr. Coleridge, formerly of Jesus College, are well known. He obtained one of the prizes at Cambridge, and but one, for a Greek ode. Being once in company with a person who had gained two prizes, the latter carried himself with an air of superiority and triumph, and seemed to estimate his own abilities above Coleridge's, in the ratio of at least two to one. A person in company growing, at length, indignant at the vaunting airs of the conceited young fellow, exclaimed, 'Why zounds, Sir, a man's leg may as easily be too big for the boot, as your's just fitted it.'" Dyer's story brought from Coleridge a letter of protest:<sup>4</sup>

I felt no resentment or offence on my own account; nor as much concern as a tolerably careful man ought to feel. This you will readily admit if you reflect that the person who could have won 2 prizes, when I had won only one, might be immediately detected by referring to the University

<sup>3</sup> MS. letter. See also Campbell, *Poetical Works*, 575-6.

<sup>4</sup> MS. letter.

Book/—Luckily no such person then existed—tho' it is not unlikely that either Mr Butler or Mr Frere would apply it to themselves, & consider it as a calumny.—However, I repeat to you that my concern was *for you* not for *myself*—on *general* principles, not the consequence of a particular Feeling. Good Heavens, my dear Sir! who would dare open their mouths in your presence, if it were generally known that you would without their knowledge or consent *publish* any anecdote of them and with their names—tho' the anecdote might have been possibly an escape of venial Vanity in the Flush of Wine, probably tho' strictly Truth yet Truth, of such a nature, that publicity would make it more mischievous than falsehood—besides the reluctance to be named in a public Journal is a valuable characteristic of an Englishman, & should neither be invaded nor on light grounds given up. . . . As I never felt, so it is not possible that I can retain the least offence; but *one demand I must make*, & I will take the liberty of stating it to you with unmistakeable Plainness—to wit, that you *do not* correct the account *at all*, nor in *any way re-peat my name*, nor in *any way attempt to draw back the attention & recollection of the Readers of the Dyerhoca Cantabrigiensis to that anecdote*. *Let it perish / stirring up a—never yet lessened the Stench*. These things die of their own inanity if not industriously kept alive.

As a postscript to his letter, Coleridge remarked that he was enclosing three epigrams; "if printed at all, they must be printed without my name—and may be said to be by a Student of Jesus College, Cambridge."

The promised epigrams are no longer a part of Coleridge's manuscript letter, but were almost certainly those printed by Dyer in his "Cantabrigiana." The first two appeared in the *Monthly Magazine* in April 1804, the third in June.

From off that delicate fair cheek,  
Oh Maid, too fair, I did but seek  
To steal a kiss, and lo! your face,  
    With anger or with shame it glows;  
What have I done, my gentle Grace,  
    But change a lily to a rose?

At once your cheek and brow were flush'd,  
Your neck and ev'n your bosom blushed;  
And shame may claim the larger part,  
    In that smooth neck, and all above:  
But the blush so near the heart,  
    Oh! let it be a blush of love.  
Pygmalion thus lit up with life  
The statue that became his wife.

Epigram—

Dear Anne, a wond'rous Trinity  
Hath made thee a Divinity,  
The being strangely beautiful,  
And strangely chaste and dutiful,  
And what is more than either,  
The being each together.

Balsamum in vitro.

Charity's a balsam—woman's but a glass—  
That, alas! how costly!—how fragile, this, alas!

EARL LESLIE GRIGGS

*University of California,  
Los Angeles*

WAS THERE A PLAY ON THE MARTYRDOM OF  
HUGH OF LINCOLN?

Arthur F. Leach, who in his lecture before the British Academy in 1913 corrected some of the current superstitions about the schools of the Middle Ages, was nevertheless responsible in the same paper for creating a neat little mare's nest in English dramatic history. He there announced a remarkable discovery.<sup>1</sup>

By an odd chance I found William Wheatley, the first Lincoln school-master whose name is known, through one of his books, a commentary on Boethius being at New College, Oxford. It contains two hymns addressed to St. Hugh of Lincoln, which 'a certain young clerk [himself], master of Lincoln Grammar School in the year 1316, composed for a play on Christmas Day, in which year there was great scarcity and mortality among men and animals, intending to comfort himself and others in their misery.' So the production of plays by schoolmasters . . . was equally prevalent in the fourteenth as it had been in the twelfth and was to be in the sixteenth century.

In his book, *The Schools of Medieval England*, published in 1915,<sup>2</sup> Leach reasserted his discovery of a new play.

"Master William Wetelay (Wheatley) . . . taught school at Stamford A. D. 1309." He was afterwards master of Lincoln Grammar School, where

<sup>1</sup> *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 1913-14, p. 444.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 192 f.

he composed another book preserved at New College, Oxford, on Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy*, with two hymns to St. Hugh of Lincoln, which he tells us he composed for a play produced at Christmas, 1316, in which year there was great scarcity and mortality, to comfort himself and others in their misery.

The omnivorous J. M. Manly evidently came across one or both of these notices and, his mind being full of the legends of the little Hugh of Lincoln, who was supposed to have been murdered by Jews in 1255, he wrote in *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, XIII (1928), 53 f., as follows:<sup>3</sup>

That lively traditions of this event [the ritual sacrifice of little Hugh] still persisted in the city of Lincoln is strongly suggested by the existence there during the fourteenth century of a Miracle Play on the subject. This play has escaped the attention of historians of the drama, but it is definitely recorded as having been performed at Christmas, 1316. Students familiar with the history of the drama in England will hardly doubt that the play was repeated year after year for many years. If this play, or a successor on the same subject, was an established institution at Lincoln in the fourteenth century, it is barely possible that Chaucer may have seen it and highly probable that he had heard of it. . . . In the year 1386 . . . Philippa Chaucer [Geoffrey's wife], together with Henry, earl of Derby, afterwards King Henry IV, Sir Thomas Swynford, and six others were given letters of fraternity in Lincoln Cathedral and admitted to participation in the merits and prayers of the clergy. Such an event as this must certainly have specially attracted Chaucer's attention to the cathedral and its traditions, and it is at least not impossible that some circumstances connected with the event may have suggested the composition of this affecting tale [the Prioress's Tale]. . . . I am aware that this supposition is purely speculative and that none of the arguments in its favour has any compulsive force. I merely suggest that on the whole this seems a possible, if not a probable, genesis of the story.

It should be stated, in case anyone is not aware of the fact, that the Prioress's Tale deals not with little Hugh of Lincoln, though he is mentioned, but with another anonymous boy martyr. Professor F. N. Robinson in his notes on the Tale<sup>4</sup> refers to Manly's suggestion respectfully, saying that the story of Hugh of Lincoln

<sup>3</sup> Manly summarizes his opinion in the notes to his edition of the *Canterbury Tales* (New York, 1928), p. 627, as follows: "A play on the subject [of the murder of young Hugh of Lincoln] was performed in Lincoln at Christmas, 1316, which was probably still played in Chaucer's time. He may have heard of it from his wife or his sister-in-law."

<sup>4</sup> *Complete Works of Chaucer* (Boston, 1933), p. 841.



was "the subject of a miracle play known to have been performed at Lincoln in 1316. He [Manly] observes that Chaucer, who had various reasons for interest in Lincolnshire, may have seen some later representations." Professor R. M. Wilson also refers to the play in *The Lost Literature of Medieval England* (London, 1952), p. 226.

When some few years ago I was preparing a paper on "Lincoln as a Dramatic Centre," I encountered Manly's hypothesis and traced its source in Leach. And though it seemed to me, as to Manly, very natural that a schoolmaster should compose for a Lincoln audience a play on the subject of the martyred boy of Lincoln, I reflected that there were two St. Hughs of Lincoln and that I had better make sure which was meant. Furthermore, the torturing and crucifixion of a little boy seemed a topic hardly likely to furnish comfort in a time of great scarcity and mortality. So I sent to the kindly officials of the Bodleian Library, where the manuscript New College 264 is kept, and I was supplied with photostats of folios 262r to 265v. The very first words informed me that the subject of the hymns was "sancti hugonis lincolniensis episcopi vite sanctitas et eiusdem innata probitas." Accordingly, when I published my article on drama at Lincoln, I wrote as follows:<sup>5</sup>

A young cleric William Wetelay, master of the grammar school, has left us two hymns, addressed to St. Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln, which he composed in 1316 for a play on Christmas day, with the intent to comfort himself and others in a season of great scarcity and mortality. Unfortunately except for the subject and the fact that it was in Latin, we know nothing about this consolatory piece.

I also attached a note calling attention to Manly's error. There could no longer be any question of a miracle play about the murder of a little Christian boy, composed to make life sweeter in a time of hardship and pestilence. There was no use in speculating whether Chaucer had seen such a play and had been inspired by it to write the Prioress's Tale, for the play—if it existed—was on a totally different subject.

I realized, however, that the matter needed more attention, for the photostats which had been sent me did not furnish the author's

<sup>5</sup> *Mélanges d'Histoire du Théâtre du Moyen-Age et de la Renaissance Offerts à Gustave Cohen* (Paris, 1950), p. 242.

name and really said nothing about a play. So when I visited Oxford in 1952 I decided to see where Leach had found the name and the specific reference to a drama for which the Latin hymns had been prepared. I found the former on fol. 253r, col. 1: "Reverendo viro amico suo ac domino helie de Wethelay suus W. clericulus ac consanguineus salutem. . . ." And in the next column occurs the name in Latin translation: "ego W. de frumenti lege. . . ." But nowhere was there any information about the play. What Leach had before him as the basis of his announcement and what I had already seen in photostat was simply this:<sup>6</sup>

Causa efficiens est quidam clericulus qui rexit scholas grammaticales lincolnie anno ab incarnatione domini millesimo tricentesimo sextodecimo quo anno in festo natali domini istos ymnos ludendo composuit. Et quo anno magna in mundo fuit caristia et sterilitas ac hominum et aliorum animalium mortalitas, una cum duobus annis precedentibus, intendens per istos duos ymnos illuminare cecos, confortare mestos, reducere desperatos, seipsum et alios confortare miseros.

So far as one can discover, then, there was no dramatic performance at all. "Ludendo composuit" simply means that William composed the hymns for playing, perhaps on the organ, certainly on some instrument. The moral, of course, is the old one: Never trust even the best of secondary authorities, but go back to the texts.

ROGER SHERMAN LOOMIS

*Columbia University*

---

#### WORDS INTO IMAGES IN CHAUCER'S *HOUS OF FAME* A THIRD SUGGESTION

One of the more curious touches in Chaucer's *Hous of Fame* is to be found at the end of the second book when, in what seems to be an afterthought, as though it had just occurred to the writer that he might be expected to answer how mere words could be visible in the palace of Fame, Chaucer has the eagle explain to "Geffrey" that although there are no real bodies there, the words spoken on earth will accommodate themselves to his sight by assuming the form, the image of the person who spoke them. Actually,

<sup>6</sup> Ms. New College, Oxford, 264, f. 262r, col. 1.

far from being a casual afterthought, the device of converting words into images is a fundamental consideration in the depiction of a super-material world; that which is super-sensory can only be made available to the minds of men by such conversion. The eagle's summary of the matter is as follows:

But o thing y will warne the  
Of the whiche thou wolt have wonder.  
Loo, to the Hous of Fame yonder,  
Thou wost now how, cometh every speche;  
Hyt nedeth noght eft the to teche.  
But understond now ryght wel this,  
Whan any speche ycomen ys  
Up to the paleys, anon-ryght  
Hyt wexeth lyk the same wight  
Which that the word in erthe spak,  
Be hyt clothed red or blak;  
And hath so verray hys lyknesse  
That spak the word, that thou wilt gesse  
That it the same body be,  
Man or woman, he or she.<sup>1</sup>

Up to the present time there have been two explanations towards clarifying the passage in terms of analogue and source: that of Jerry Turner Williams<sup>2</sup> who cites the thirteenth-century Hebrew *Zohar* as employing such a device, and that of Julian Ziegler<sup>3</sup> who sees a resemblance and possible source in the first prose and meter of *Boece*, book iv. There is, to my mind, a more probable source for the accommodation of words into images in the *Divine Comedy*, a source that appeals to me as being more likely since

<sup>1</sup> Chaucer's *Complete Works*, ed. F. N. Robinson (Cambridge, 1933), *Hous of Fame*, ll. 1068-1081.

<sup>2</sup> "Words into Images in Chaucer's *Hous of Fame*," *MLN* LXII (1947), 488-90.

<sup>3</sup> "Two Notes on J. T. Williams' 'Words into Images in Chaucer's *Hous of Fame*,'" *MLN* LXIV (1949), 73-76. The source in Boethius which Mr. Ziegler posits is of course the very meter which Chaucer himself has just quoted in *HF*, ll. 973-978. Chaucer does not bother to do more than summarize the opening lines of the meter because most of the details that it contains he has already incorporated in one way or another into his second book. Calling our attention so pointedly to the meter was, I suppose, merely a way of corroborating his own just completed description of the flight into the upper air.

hints of its influence are strewn throughout the structure of the *House of Fame*.

In canto iii of *Paradiso* Dante mistakes the faint outlines of the blessed spirits for reflections. He is assured by Beatrice that they are *vere sustanze*, real beings,<sup>4</sup> and he then proceeds to speak with the spirit of Piccarda. There is, however, a question remaining in his mind about the appearance of spirits on the various planets, a question which is answered by Beatrice to the effect that the blessed actually have their permanent dwelling in the Empyrean and that their appearing to him on the various planets constitutes both an accommodation to his sight and a vehicle for their words. Her words of explanation in canto iv are as follows:

Qui si mostraron, non perchè sortita  
 Sia questa spera lor, ma per far segno  
 De la celestial c' ha men salita.  
 Così parlar conviensi al vostro ingegno,  
 Però che solo da sensato apprende  
 Ciò che fa poscia d' intelletto degno.  
 Per questo la Scrittura condescende  
 A vostra facultate e piedi e mano  
 Attribuisce a Dio, ed altro intende;  
 E santa Chiesa con aspetto umano  
 Gabriel e Michel vi rappresenta,  
 E l'altro che Tobia rifece sano.<sup>5</sup>

Dante's concern here is to present Paradise as visible, to give the spirits of that realm recognizable aspects. His reason for so doing is clearly explained: only from sense perceptions is man's knowledge derived. Faced with the same problem, Chaucer seems to have met it in approximately the same way; thus the nine companies of suitors, the great rout of shipmen, pilgrims and pardoners in the house of rumor, and even the man of great authority whom he says "y saugh" are rendered accessible to us in their human guises and actions. And so a world that is really beyond sense, immaterial, becomes available, so to speak, to mortal intelligence. No other poem illustrates so much as this one the difference between the two poets: Dante determined to explain away a poisonous heresy, the enslavement of souls to a material

<sup>4</sup> *La Divina Commedia di Dante Alighieri*, ed. and annotated by C. H. Grandgent (Boston, 1933), *Par.* III, 29.

<sup>5</sup> *Par.* IV, 37-48.

universe; and Chaucer stripping the philosophy away from the bare bones of a device, the accommodation of words into images, and writing with the unadorned directness of his genius. Regardless of the difference in the use of such a device, both poets find it to their purpose at approximately the same point in their story: Dante on the very threshold of Paradise, Chaucer at the moment of his entrance into the realm of Fame.

PAUL G. RUGGIERS

*University of Oklahoma*

---

#### CHAUCER'S SECOND NUN'S TALE: TIBURCE'S VISIT TO POPE URBAN

This note attempts to clarify the meaning of lines 352-353 in the Second Nun's Tale of Chaucer. When Valerian's brother Tiburce went to Pope Urban, "He cristned hym, and made hym in that place/Parfit in his lernynge, Goddes knyght." As far as I can ascertain, commentators have assumed that this is only a lengthy way of saying that the Pope baptized him; actually, it quite clearly means that he also administered the sacrament of Confirmation to him.

One reason why this fact has been obscured is that certain (shorter) versions of the legend of St. Cecilia refer only to a "purificacio," which would indicate Baptism alone. Apparently the more popular versions (Caxton's e.g.) are of this type; and thus has arisen the habit of referring simply to the "baptism" of Tiburce, as G. H. Gerould does in passing in Bryan and Dempster's *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales* (p. 669). The typical shorter version given there says: "Tunc Tyburcius fratri suo dixit: Miserere mei et perduc me ad hominem Dei ut purificationem accipiam. Ductus igitur et purificatus, angelos Dei sepe uidebat. . . ." (p. 674) But it is quite evident that Chaucer was following a different version from this very point onwards. The longer text of Mombritius also given in Bryan and Dempster reads: "[Papa Urbanus] suscepit Tyburtium cum omni gaudio: et baptizans eum secum esse praecepit: quoadusque albas deponeret: Quem perfectum doctrina sua per septem dies Christo militem

consecrauit" (p. 677). This makes it clear that: 1) after Tiburce had been baptized, Pope Urban commanded him to stay with him until he had laid aside the white baptismal garment (traditionally worn for a week after Baptism); 2) the Pope made him "perfect" in his doctrine during that time and 3) consecrated him a soldier of Christ. Grammatically speaking, "per septem dies" could mean either that Tiburce was instructed for seven days or consecrated for seven days; but since the Church has never known any consecration which lasts for seven days, that interpretation would be absurd.

The important phrase is "Christo militem consecrauit"—"consecrated him a soldier of [for] Christ." Today every Catholic catechism speaks of Confirmation as the sacrament which "makes us strong and perfect Christians and soldiers of Jesus Christ"; and as the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* shows in its lengthy article on Confirmation (Vol. III, Pt. I, cols. 975-1103), the expression, "soldier of Christ," has been used since the earliest days of the Church to designate the special supernatural effect of this sacrament.<sup>1</sup> It was always, says the *Dictionnaire* in summary, considered as the "complement naturel" of Baptism. "A la

<sup>1</sup> From among many references to Migne's *Patres Latini* and *Patres Graeci* we shall give only a few. Tertullian, claiming that Satan inspires idolatrous rites in imitation of Christian rites, mentions a pagan washing to forgive sins (Baptism) and an offering of bread (the Mass) and says next that "Mithra signat illic in frontibus milites suos" (*P. L.*, 806). This last remark, accompanied by no explanation, assumes that his readers know a Christian rite, distinct from Baptism, which creates soldiers of Christ. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in an instruction on Confirmation, tells his catechumens that when they have put on the complete armor of the Holy Spirit through Baptism and Confirmation, they must fight against their enemies (*P. G.*, xxxiii, 1091). Peter Damian in the eleventh century says the same thing and points out that the decretals and the Fathers warn baptized persons not to defer Confirmation, lest they be unarmed against Satan (*P. L.*, cxliv, 898).

St. Thomas in his *Summa Theologica*, Pars III, Q. LXXII, "De Sacramento Confirmationis," uses again and again such expressions and ideas as the following. "In baptismo regeneramur ad vitam, post baptismum confirmamur ad pugnam, in baptismo abluimur, post baptismum roboramur" (Art. I, *corpus*). "... licet baptizatus sit effectus membrum Ecclesiae, nondum tamen est adscriptus militiae christianae" (Art. X, ad 2). In Confirmation "... insignitur signo crucis sicut miles signo ducis. . . ." (Art. 9, *corpus*)



naissance correspond la régénération baptismale, qui fait du baptisé un enfant de Dieu et de l'Eglise; à la maturité, le sacrement de confirmation, qui fait du confirmé un parfait chrétien, un soldat" (col. 1051).

One difficulty, though not a serious one, occurs. St. Cecilia addresses a group newly baptized (but not confirmed) as "Cristes owene knyghtes" and goes on to urge them, in St. Paul's words, to put on their armor and perservere in the battle (379-390). Are merely baptized Christians, then, "soldiers of Christ"? If so, how can we confine this term to those confirmed? It is true that this type of speech is not unknown in reference to Baptism (see, for instance, St. Cyril of Jerusalem in Migne, *P. G.*, XXXIII, 443). The answer is, as St. Thomas Aquinas indicates, that all Christians must indeed fight against their spiritual enemies (and so in the wide sense all can be called soldiers of Christ); but Confirmation's special effect is precisely to call them to battle and to prepare them for it "quasi ex officio" (*Summa Theologica*, Pars III, Q. LXXII, Art. V, *ad* 1 and 2). In the case of Tiburce, an inspection of Chaucer's source in the light of constant Christian teaching and terminology leaves no doubt whatsoever: Tiburce is baptized, is instructed for a week while he is wearing the white baptismal garment and then is "consecrated a soldier of Christ." In such a context, the latter phrase could have only one meaning for Chaucer and for us: Tiburce received the sacrament of Confirmation.

CYRIL A. REILLY

Loras College,  
Dubuque, Iowa

#### GOTHIC IUP 'áw'

The solutions offered to date (see, for example, Feist<sup>3</sup> 298a and, more recently, Walde-Hofmann<sup>3</sup> 2.616, 1952) for the etymology of this word are not in all respects satisfying: Everything points to the presence of an apparent IE \*b in the etymon of this form. This interpretation has several disadvantages:

1. Except for the Keltic forms found in OIrish *uabar* 'Eitelkeit,' all other IE forms of the vast tribe illustrated by Goth. *uf*, *ufar*,

and *ubizwa* (Feist<sup>3</sup> 509 and 508a), with which it is semantically desirable to associate the form in question, show IE \**p*.

2. The other Gmc. forms with Gmc. *p* (e. g. OE *up*, *upp*) show gemination, whatever its debated source, which means that for them we are not forced to assume Gmc. *p* < IE \**b*.

3. Feist (298a) tries to bolster his assumed IE \**ubo* by appealing to Lat. *sub* and *ab*, as against *super* and Gk. ἀπό. This involves great complexities within Italic which need only be alluded to here: Lat. *ab*, Umbr. *ap* (cognate lacking in Oscan), Lat. *ob*, Osc. *op* (cognate lacking in Umbrian), and Lat. *sub*, Umbr. *sub*, Osc. *sup* are not consistent amongst themselves; against Gk. ἀπό, ἐπί, ὑπό, if we were to assume syncope of the final vowels, on the basis of the treatment of Italic *-k* and *-t* (by syncope) we should expect universal voiceless stops; if we were to assume original forms in *-C*, on the basis of the development of original \**-t* we should expect consistent voicing. Perhaps the simplest solution is to start with IE alternates \**hapo*~\**hap*; \**Eopy*~\**Eop*;<sup>1</sup> \**swpo*~\**swp*. With syncope we then get Italic \**ap*~\**ab*; \**op*~\**ob*; \**sup*~\**sub*. These assumptions, framed on several grounds, make a form with IE \**b* unnecessary.

4. Everyone knows about the rarity of "IE \**b*." The tendency today, supported by consideration of present-day views on structural patterning in phonemic systems and by the near absence of cases that cannot be explained otherwise, is to posit for earlier IE a complete blank in the pattern where, a priori, we might look for a \**b* phoneme. This is not the place for guesses as to the earlier developments leading to this blank.

<sup>1</sup> *h* and *E* here represent IE phonemes currently referred to as "laryngeals," the properties of which are stated in the discussion that follows. *E* is a cover-symbol for one of two phonemes where from the evidence we cannot tell which of the two known e-colouring laryngeals it actually was. For simplicity's sake I follow in this paper the notation of E. H. Sturtevant (*Hittite Grammar*<sup>2</sup>, New Haven, 1951), as modified by W. Lehmann (*Proto-Indo-European Phonology*, Austin, 1952). Though I consider that the Anatolian subgroup was the first known dialect to leave IE, I do not thereby bind myself to the Indo-Hittite hypothesis as conceived by Sturtevant; I therefore prefer to label reconstructions simply as "IE," and, for that matter, since we do not as yet know at what rate the laryngeals were lost in early dialect stages, many reconstructions may apply equally well to post-Anatolian IE.

Following the lead suggested by Skt. *pībati*, and its cognates, where by assuming a voiced laryngeal \* $\gamma$  an acceptable reconstruction \**pý-p $\gamma$ -ety*, with present-tense reduplication, can be framed, we may in isolation posit for *iup* an IE \**Eewp $\gamma$ -*. Since according to current theory no IE form began with a vowel, we must here posit an *e*-colouring laryngeal, which I write *E*. If we are still to associate our form with *uf*, etc., we must assume we have here a suffix containing a laryngeal, to which in general there is naturally no objection.

There is, however, a further objection now opened which we were not previously in a position to raise, a difficulty centering on the initial laryngeal.

In a paper which I intend to publish shortly and in which I deal in detail with the fate of the IE laryngeals in Albanian, I show that IE \**h* (the *a*-colouring laryngeal that does *not* appear in Hittite as *h*(*ḫ*)) gives in initial position Albanian *h*-. In the dialect of the village of Vaccarizzo Albanese, in the south of Italy, a dialect I happen to know well that retains common Albanian *h* with great fidelity, the reflex is  $\gamma$ -. The Geg (northern Albanian) form for 'mount' is *hyp*, while Vaccarizzo has *γíp*-.; there is no good reason, except for our Gothic form, to dissociate this from Gothic *uf*, Hittite *upzi* 'rises (of the sun),' etc. If we accept this identification we must reconstruct IE \**hwp*-. The full grade would have been \**hawp*- (< \**héwp*-), and this clashes formally, however seductive the semantics are, with \**Eewp $\gamma$ -* above.

If the above reasoning is correct, a choice must be made. In view of the several difficulties above outlined and of its isolation, for the time being *iup* cannot be considered connected with *uf* and its numerous brethren.

ERIC P. HAMP

University of Chicago

---

#### FIGUIÈRE AND LA ROCHEFOUCAULD

Here are some parallelisms, never to my knowledge reported, between *l'Esprit fort, ou les armes du sage* (1650), by le Sieur de Figuière, and the *Maximes* of La Rochefoucauld (1665):

## Figuière

p. 44: Bien qu'en apparence les adversités doivent ébranler les âmes les plus fortes et les mieux préparées, néanmoins les affaires nous font voir que la plus extrême de toutes . . . n'est jamais si dangereuse qu'une parfaite prospérité.

p. 76: Si nous nous précipitons à rendre un bienfait, cette précipitation étant une marque assurée d'une ambition à ne rien devoir, nous passons pour ingrats parmi les moins (*sic*) délicats en cette matière.

p. 110: Il arrive le plus souvent que la faiblesse des sens est cause de la chasteté et de la sobriété que nous admirons, que le défaut de l'appréhension et le manquement du jugement font toute cette tranquillité et toute cette assurance dont nous nous émerveillons, et qu'enfin l'ambition, la crainte et l'avarice font la valeur, la discrétion, et la sagesse du plus grand nombre.

## La Rochefoucauld

Maxime 25: Il faut de plus grandes vertus pour soutenir la bonne fortune que la mauvaise.

Maxime 226: Le trop grand empressément qu'on a de s'acquitter d'une obligation est une espèce d'ingratitude.

Maxime 1: Ce que nous prenons pour des vertus n'est souvent qu'un assemblage de diverses actions et de divers intérêts que la fortune ou notre industrie savent arranger, et ce n'est pas toujours par valeur et par chasteté que les hommes sont vaillants et que les femmes sont chastes.

220. La vanité, la honte, et surtout le tempérament, font souvent la valeur des hommes et la vertu des femmes.

See also 213, 564, 593.

*L'Esprit fort* is very little known. I find no trace of it in the BN, the BM, the LC. (My own copy came from the library of Émile Magne.) The BN has by Figuière only a pamphlet: *Les dernières paroles de M. de Saint-Chamond, décédé en son hostel à Paris le 10 de septembre, 1649*. The liminary matter of *l'Esprit fort* informs us that Figuière had written a book called *la Vertu à la mode*, of which I find no record. The Sieur de Figuière is as obscure as his work. In his dedication of *l'Esprit fort* to Louis de Lorraine, duc de Joyeuse, he lets drop that he had served in thirteen or fourteen campaigns under the comte d'Harcourt, and had been "dans la reprise des îles, dans l'armée navale, dans les plaines de Piedmont, dans les marais de Gravelines, dans les campagnes de Rome, dans le désert de Catalogne, dans l'état du duc de Modène." The *Privilege du Roy* characterizes him as "le sieur de Figuière,

capitaine dans le vieux Ferron, aide de camp en nos armées." The *privilege*, to hold for five years, was signed at Saint-Germain on April 25, 1649.

Figuère apparently made no impression on his contemporaries. I find no record of his name, in the course of a somewhat random search. La Rochefoucauld may well have known him, in the plains of Piedmont or in Paris in 1649. (But the parallelisms cited above are not beyond the reach of coincidence.) Figuière's book, which appeared in the midst of the Fronde, seems to have been a total failure. Well, like many other authors, he must needs console himself by reading his own book; it was most aptly subtitled: *les armes du sage pour combattre . . . la mauvaise fortune, par la connaissance de soi-même*.

MORRIS BISHOP

*Cornell University*

A EUPHEMISTIC ALLUSION TO THE *REEVE'S TALE*

Nathaniel Whiting's "Il Insonio Insonadado"<sup>1</sup> (1638) is one of the few critical poems which our histories of criticism have missed. While there is nothing in it of great interest except a few comments on contemporary poets,<sup>2</sup> it does contain an allusion to Chaucer which even Miss Spurgeon seems to have overlooked:

A great while since the cheating miller stole 421  
The scholars' meal by a quadruple toll:  
They gave him th' hornbook, taught his daughter Greek,  
Yet look in Chaucer—done the other week.

In his roll call of the poets Whiting places Chaucer second among the moderns:

Amongst the moderns came the Fairy Queen, 190  
Old Geoffrey, Sidney, Drayton, Randolph, Greene,

<sup>1</sup> George Saintsbury, *Minor Poets of the Caroline Period*. (Oxford, 1921) III, 540.

<sup>2</sup> Saintsbury points particularly to the "solid and judicial" quatrain about Donne:

Donne was a poet and a grave divine 429  
Highly esteemed for the Sacred Nine  
That aftertimes shall say whilst there's a sun,  
'This verse, this sermon, was composed by Dun.'

Later, however, when a poet is called to defend poetry, he says that, "Old Geoffrey's language was not fit for plea."

JOHN OWEN

*University of Florida*

---

NOTE ON THE HISTORY OF JACK THE GIANT KILLER

In the "History of Jack and Giant Killer" (Andrew Lang, *The Blue Fairy Book*, London, 1893, p. 337) Jack has an eating contest with a giant, in which he deceives the latter by concealing under his coat a leathern bag. He pretends to consume a great amount of hasty pudding by surreptitiously stuffing it into the bag. Then he cuts the bag with a knife and the pudding tumbles to the floor. The story continues with the giant saying "Ods splutter hur nails, hur can do that hursel," as he plunges the knife into his stomach and perishes.

According to the *New English Dictionary*, *Od* is a minced form for *God* originating around 1600. Among phrases of an asseverative or exclamatory nature including this form are *Od's blood*, *Od's body*, *Od's bones*, *Od's foot*, etc. This would indicate that "Ods splutter hur nails" is a corruption of *Od's blood and his nails*. When such expressions passed out of common use, this probably became a mere nonsense line to the story-tellers and so underwent the phonetic changes apparent in the present form. The substitution of *hur* for *his* may have been deliberate in the original form of the story to indicate an imperfect command of the language by the giant, who probably represents the aboriginal race being pushed back by the invader.

MAX S. KIRCH

*University of Delaware*

---



## A 1593 CHAUCER ALLUSION

Unrecorded in Caroline Spurgeon's *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion* is the following, culled from Edmund Southerne's *A Treatise Concerning the Right Use and Ordering of Bees* (London, 1593):

*Therefore my humble suite is, for that you have had some triall of my skill, as occasion shall serve, that you will, in my behalfe, against such barking curs, remember, (this saying of Chaucer) Let them speake what they will, but trust well this: a wicked tongue will ever say amisse.*

(Sig. A2v)

Southerne would seem to be in error in attributing the couplet to Chaucer; at least, it is not to be found in the Chaucer concordance, nor do I find it in the apocryphal works attributed to Chaucer in the 16th century. The second line of the couplet has an obviously proverbial ring, but I do not find the proverb recorded in either *The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs* or Tilley's *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England*. The nearest approach is "A false tongue will hardly speak truth" for which Tilley (T 383) gives a 1616 citation.

Southerne, who writes in a pleasantly colloquial style with the gusto of a dedicated apiarist, sprinkles proverbs liberally throughout his work. I note an early appearance of "Far fetcht and deare bought is good for Ladies" (Tilley, D 12), and "The cat should wet her feete if she will eate any fish" (Tilley, C 144). The book will almost certainly yield other examples to proverb collectors.

PHILIP WILLIAMS

*Duke University*

---

# REVIEWS

*Propalladia and Other Works of Bartolomé de Torres Naharro.*  
 Edited by JOSEPH E. GILLET. Vol. III. Bryn Mawr: Bryn  
 Mawr College, 1951. Pp. 891.

It is useless to insist on the excellency of Prof. Gillet's edition. See A. F. G. Bell's review in *MLN*, LXI, 557-9.

Now that we have his volume of notes it is with awe and with enthusiasm together that we peruse these 891 pages, for in such an imposing mass nothing is superfluous or second-hand, everything shows a supreme familiarity with the most uncommon and yet most instructive sources of sixteenth century and modern popular Spanish. The bibliography comprises nearly 1000 items.

It is hard to say whether we learn more from the author's universal erudition about facts and ideas or about the language of Renaissance Spain and Italy. His notes on divination and astronomy (pp. 629-32), on black magic (334-5), on society games (324-6), on the *danza de espadas* (796-8), on racketeering techniques in armies (428-30), on the life of soldiers (397-8 and in his whole commentary of the *Comedia Soldadesca*), etc., are a treasure of information on the ways and customs of the time. No less rich on the ideas of the epoch are his comments on such matters as the prestige of illustrious names (408-9, 411-12), Portuguese boasting (482), the opinions concerning the elephant (40-41), early attempts at flying (372-4) and many more. A wealth of historical and literary knowledge is hoarded when he speaks about Cesar Borja's death (399), about the tradition of Macias o Namorado (78-79), about Mandinga and Melinde (329-33), about the extent of *castellano* and *español* in popular contemporary usage (167-9) and the like.

It is perhaps the lexicographer who can profit most from Gillet's book: his comment on *bisoño* (418-20)<sup>1</sup> or *zancarrón* (767-9), e. g., is all-embracing. But grammar and phraseology are scarcely less elucidated: cf. his treatment of the rare split conditional (*estáros ié mejor, cómo ía de ser verdad*, 423), or the exhaustive studies on figurative expressions of small quantity (567-9), on country names in the plural (*las Alemanias* etc., 793-6), on oaths and asseverations, as treated not only on pp. 319-20, but in an endless number of passages collected in the index. Only an attentive examination of the index can give a real notion of the immense extent of the

<sup>1</sup> For the origin we may still refer to *Symposium* 1948, 107, 117, and compare *Soldadesca* v, 94.

riches that are made available to us. The General Index refers to some 2000 words and to other special items (often so rich in references as 'Bible,' 'conjurations,' 'games,' 'puns,' 'topoi'). The Linguistic Index comprises sections on Catalan (880-1), Italian (881-2), and a long list of Italianisms (882-4), which will provide from now on an indispensable complement to Terlingen's book. The Spanish section embraces phonology, morphology, syntax, pronouns, adjectives, verbs, particles and style, each of these divisions containing from several hundreds to about fifty references. The index of proverbs alone goes from p. 885 to p. 891.

As he is bolstered by immense learning and by a sure judgment, it is very hard to find a place where the critic is able to disagree with Prof. Gillet or even add something to what he says. *Saje* 'cruel' (p. 614) does not come from *sajar* 'to bleed' but is borrowed from Cat. *saig* 'executioner, tormentor' (Goth. \**sagjis*) = Sp. *sayón*. No need to think that *pujés* 'insulting gesture' is a different word from *pujés* 'small coin' (p. 690): *higa* 'fig' and *pujés* being both commonplace as figurative expressions for contemptible things (*no vale una higa* or *un pujés*, *no se me da una h.* or *un p.*), when *pujés* was borrowed from Catalan this foreign word was given in Castile the whole semantic range of its synonym *higa*; the variant *pujer* that puzzles Prof. Gillet originated as a development of the difficult group *sf* in frequent combinations like *un pujés foradado*. I doubt very much that *parar(se)* 'to get upright' has ever existed in Spain (pp. 564-6); in *se paró a la gelosia* and in *parar la escalera arrimada a la puerta* it simply means 'to place in such and such a place or position,' in *parar un tablado muy alto* it has the etymological value 'to prepare'; in Catalan the American meaning has never existed (*parar una pistola* is 'to get it ready,' even though for that purpose something has to be lifted). There is no doubt that the *l* of *solombra* (p. 125) appeared as an echo of that of the opposite *sol*, and not because of a contamination by *sublustris* (which never existed in Romance) or as a continuation of *sub illa umbra*, since it is not an adverbial expression. Such a dieresis as *müestra* (p. 430) seems inconceivable to me: *pasō en* would be less violent, but in spite of the princeps edition it seems better in such a case to print *pasado*, since shortened participles are very rare in the present perfect. Why is the name of the author of *Cuerpo enfermo de la milicia española* (M., 1594) accented Marcos de *Isabá*? No reason for doubting that it is identical with the name of the Navarran town *Isaba*.

The editor shows an outstanding knowledge even of Catalan, in which Torres Naharro wrote a great part of the *Comedia Seraphina* and short fragments of the *Tinellaria*. It is not rare for him to quote examples of Catalan forms not recorded by any dictionary, as *orada* feminine of *orat* (p. 297). For a few corrections see Sanchis Guarner, *RPhCal.* v, 220-2. P. 371 read "yo·t pregue tantes

vegades, /com mana la causa mia, /yo·l veja . . ." and understand 'I ask you, as required by my cause (= interest), that I see him . . .' if it were *comanar* 'recommend' the *mm* would be unaccountable and it should be *yo·t comane*. Further down *paeirca* does not belong to a verb \**padèixer* 'to suffer' (the only existing form is *patir*; *padeixer* in Escrig is an arbitrary adaptation of Sp. *padecer* that has never been used) but to *pair* 'to digest,' figuratively used, as today, in the meaning of 'tolerate' (*no el pot pair*). *Jas!*, *jau!* (p. 253), 'here it is,' do not have anything to do with Sp. *jo* 'stop' (which is Catalan *xo*) but come from Lat. (*ha*)*beas*, (*ha*)*beatis*, and are equal, both in meaning and etymology, to O. Sp. *evás*, *evades*. The long discussion mentioned by Gillet (pp. 369-70) on the origin of Cat. *orat* 'crazy' (>Sp. *orate*) was superfluous: it has been known for a long time that *orat*, and Prov. *aurat*, Mozar. *aurato*, Port. *ourado* 'dizzy,' are derived from Lat. *aura* 'fit of sickness.' To say "Catalan and Valencian" (p. 820) is no better than to speak about "German and Bavarian" or "French and Poitevin"; Pere Torra not Pedro Torra (p. 519).

The idiom *de rota abatida* is cited by Correas' *Vocabulario* from Cabeza de Vaca's *Relación*, and is still usual in Santo Domingo (*derrotabatida* "de retirada," Brito, *Dicc. de Criollismos*), *de rota batuda* "con total pérdida y destrucción" (Amengual) in Majorca and Minorca (*Boll. del Dicc. de la Ll. Cat.* VII, 398; x, 28); *ir de rota* 'ir por mal camino' in the anonymous continuation of Lazarillo (Rivad. III, 98). Excellent the exposition on *ramo de locura* (pp. 810-1): this value of *ram* is more living in Catalan than anywhere else, cf. Spitzer, *Miscellània Fabra* 210-4. *Mala vez* 'apenas' (p. 813) is indeed rare in Spanish, not in Portuguese, where *malavez* or *tamalavez* are current: = *mal* + O. Sp. *abés* (AD VIX).

Of course these additions are unimportant, and the above inaccuracies are insignificant. On the other hand the book is full of important data and luminous suggestions. Lack of space forces me to give very few instances. P. 421: these data show that production of *grana* 'kermes' is far older in Spain than the discovery of America, but we see by Sorapán's quotation that at his time a word distinction was made between the European *grana* and the American *cochinilla*, a fact that should be considered when we regard the latter as a Mozarabic representative of *coccinus*: however as there is no American etymology, this one may still be right and the usage may have changed from 1492 to 1614. *Bocal* (p. 523): Torres Naharro's categoric declaration shows that the Spanish word comes from Italian, in spite of Mozar. *baucal*; it is unlikely to suppose a second word *bocal* coming from *bucca* (still less *buccula*). *Rapar* 'catch, grab' (p. 671), not 'hurtar' as defined by the Academy, is the only instance of that meaning known to me; the academic one has no other foundation than the impossible deriva-

tion from *rapere* (it comes from Germ. *rapon*). *Maya* 'Queen of the May' (p. 810): here is now attested the word supposed by Carolina Michaëlis (*Canc. da Ajuda* II, 831) for her etymology of Mod. Sp. *majo*, *maja*, yet this etymology is unconvincing. Gillet is right in questioning Germ. *tirren* as etymon for Sp. *tirria*: both have a common phono-symbolic origin and the German word is recent and local. *Llorito* (p. 779) as Spanish form for the Anconitan *Loreto* shows its passage through Sicily (because of the *i*) and Catalonia (*Ll-*), during the Catalan domination of that island: a Catalan sanctuary of *Llorito* is still known near Mataró.

Excellent suggestions: Gillet proves that *chirinola* 'trouble, fight, uproar' comes from *Cerignola*, name of the famous battle where all the braves claimed to have been; the demonstration is flawless, it should only be added that the change of *ñ* into *n* and the evolution to the idea of 'group of ruffians' were made under the influence of *Cherinos*, a common name for ruffians, like *Roldán*, and coming from the name of the French Pair *Gerins* (see my *Sp. Etymological Dict.*). He also proves that the old form for *villorrio* was *villorio*, still used in Mexico, Ecuador, Portugal, perhaps even in Spain: so we have here the same suffix as in *casorio*, *velorio*, but altered as in *cimborrio* and the rustic *mamorria*, under the influence of *-orro*. *Feste* 'an insignificant thing, a residue' (p. 294), a rather rare word, found already in Juan Ruiz, cannot come of course from *festum* nor from *festuca*, for formal reasons; Gillet's comparison with Old Valencian *per un fes-te enllà* (already fifteenth century) = Sp. *por un quitame allá esas pajas* may very well hit the mark: *fes-te enllà* is 'go away' (*fes* = Sp. *haz*, imperative) but in such phrases it comes to mean 'a trifle': an old Catalanism? The etymology of *troj* has indeed been a mystery till now; Gillet's idea (p. 700) of connecting with the Germanic family of Engl. *trough* does not sound badly, but from a semantic standpoint it would be better to start from another cognate Germanic word: Goth. *\*thraúhs* (Latinized as *\*trōx*), equal to Old Norse *thró*, Ags. *thrúh*, O. H. G. *truha* 'chest, trunk, cupboard.' *Paparrasolla* 'bugbear' (p. 756): the odd-looking ending is explained by Gillet's quotations as containing the imperative of *resollar* 'to breathe deeply, to roar,' a noise made by the bugbear threatening to devour (*papar*) small children (if the form *paparrasoya* attributed to Rodrigo Caro in the 1884 edition were genuine, it would be the oldest recorded instance of *yeísmo*).

In short: Gillet's commentary is a store of indispensable information and a first rate working tool for the Hispanist.

JOHN COROMINAS

Institut d'Estudis Catalans,  
The University of Chicago

*Le Roman des Deduis.* Par GACE DE LA BUIGNE. Edition critique d'après tous les manuscrits. Par AKE BLOMQVIST. Karlshamn: Johanssons Boktryckeri, 1951. Pp. 682. (*Studia Romanica Holmiensia*, III).

Romance scholars, in Sweden and outside of Sweden, have learned to admire the editions prepared by students of Professor Gunnar Tilander. In the present instance, Ake Blomqvist speaks sincerely in thanking his renowned teacher "de sa vaste érudition et de ses précieux conseils."

Gace de la Buigne (ca. 1305—ca. 1384) began to compose his *Roman des Deduis* (Tale of Hunting) in 1359, when he was the chaplain of King Jean le Bon, and he completed it before 1377, the year when King Edward III died. The poem has no less than 12210 octosyllabic lines. Even though Gace came from Normandy, his dialect is pure francien. *Le Roman des Deduis* had *Le Roy Modus et la Royne Ratio* as a direct source and *La Chasse de Gaston Phébus* as a close imitation. It is divided into a moral section, which is tedious at times, and a didactic section, which flows smoothly: a battle of virtues and vices (with specific application to hunting) and a debate on the relative merits of hunting and of falconry.

Blomqvist is somewhat confused about the sequence of the three defective editions, which appeared in Paris. He assigns the edition of Vêrard to 1507 and that of Trepperel to 1505, and says that no date was given by Lenoir. It is really Vêrard who failed to indicate a date. According to Brunet's *Manuel*, iv, 598, Vêrard is to be dated circa 1507 and Trepperel post 1505. Now Werth, *Zts. rom. Phil.*, xii (1888), 395, dates Lenoir 1515 or 1520, Trepperel 1505, and mentions the end of the fifteenth century as the date given Vêrard by Joseph Lavallée. This date has been advanced to circa 1504 by Albert D. Menut in *A Critical Bibliography of French Literature*, i, 43. There is no doubt that the Vêrard edition came out first, that it was copied by Trepperel, and later by Lenoir.

As a basis for his edition, Blomqvist chose the excellent manuscript 757 of the Condé Museum in Chantilly. He gives it the siglum A, and reproduces it faithfully despite the difficulty of deciphering its fine script. He furnishes variants from the remaining twenty manuscripts. He traces the codex-filiation accurately, connecting A with versions J, M, and T to form a separate family. The treatment of the versification, phonology, morphology, and syntax is not only judicious, it is documented constantly by appropriate references.

Blomqvist strives to explain adequately Gace's vocabulary, which abounds in cynegetic terms, and also to make the bibliography comprehensive. Naturally very recent monographs are not mentioned. Manuscript A has *adulation* in line 1310, but most



variants read *asulation*; this intervocalic substitution is discussed in *Studia Neoph.*, XXIV (1952), 55. In line 6513 *faut* is a misreading for *fault*. In the discussion of chronology, it should be noted that the Old French dictionary of Godefroy, *Complément*, VIII p. 376b and IX p. 760c, quotes *brigueur* from *Le Roman des Deduis* 1002 and *hobereau* from *L'Estoire de la Guerre Sainte* 1625. Blomqvist is justified in defining *met* 9435 as "gésier"; this figurative use is drawn, not from the literal sense of "huche à pétrir," but rather from that of "cuve du pressoir où le vin coule." He equates *malen* 7632 curiously with *mal an*; it is connected with *malandre* in the etymological dictionary of Bloch and Wartburg. An interpretation for *a tart* and an etymology for *baut*, *baudir* have been suggested in *Phil. Quart.*, XXIX (1950), 59 and XXXII (1953), 83. The profound analysis of *mensonge* by Jud, *Vox Rom.*, XI (1950), 101-124, to which Blomqvist alludes, has been challenged by Malkiel, *Rom. Phil.*, VI (1952), 121-172. Anent the fabulous Prestre Jehan, Zarncke published a reliable account in volumes VII and VIII of *Sächsische Akad. Wiss.: Abhandl. phil-hist. Klasse*, and separately at Leipzig in 1879, but the latest account is that of Nowell in *Speculum*, XXVIII (1953), 435-445. Godefroy's translation of *soullement* 9828 as "nourriture (en parlant des faucons)" is now changed properly to "saleté." Finally, the bibliography mentions neither the two volumes of *Le Roman de Renart* published in 1948 and in 1951 by Mario Roques nor the edition of *The Art of Falconry, being the De Arte Venandi Cum Avibus of Frederick II of Hohenstaufen* (Stanford, 1943) by C. A. Wood and F. M. Fife.

While preparing this review, I could not help but be impressed by the thorough training and scientific method which the teacher has inculcated in his student. In that respect, *Le Roman des Deduis* maintains the standard set for this series by the late Håkan Tjerneld in *Moamin et Ghatrif* and for the series of "Leges Hispanicae Medii Aevi" by Max Gorosch in *El Fuero de Teruel*.

RAPHAEL LEVY

*The University of Texas*

---

*Ronsard Poète de l'Amour. Livre Premier. Cassandre.* Par FERNAND DESONAY. Brussels: Palais des Académies, 1952. Pp. 281.

This is the first volume of a work that will be in three parts, consecrated in turn to Cassandre, Marie, and Hélène. After an introduction devoted to "sites vendômois," M. Desonay discusses Ronsard as a "vert galant," the *Amours* of 1552, the fifth book

of Odes, certain other poems, and alterations made in later editions down to 1584, and even to the posthumous edition of 1587. He wisely dismisses without discussion Sorg's contention that Ronsard loved only Cassandre. He dates his love for her from 1545 to 1555 and finds in the production of these years the best of the poet's lyricism. Unlike Laumonier, Vianey, Lebègue, Jasinski, and others, he regards these poems as genuine expressions of feeling rather than primarily artistic productions, and unlike them he holds that most of Ronsard's alterations in later editions diminished their lyric quality. The suppression of exclamations, exclamatory repetitions, enjambements, and musical echoes makes the poems more in accord with rules, but less satisfactory in regard to feeling. He notes that Ronsard found the verse of ten syllables especially well suited to the expression of his love for Cassandre and that he left only one of such poems in alexandrines, an exception that he has some difficulty in explaining (p. 226). He also insists that Ronsard's love for Cassandre was very far from being platonic. His quotations show that there was a great deal of sensuality in the emotion that she inspired (pp. 105-10).

M. Desonay sees no reason for believing that the *Franciade* was begun in alexandrines (pp. 230-31). He finds that Ronsard seeks in nature "un site à composer, ou à recomposer, pour que jaillisse l'émotion amoureuse. Mais c'est l'émotion qui importe; pas le site" (p. 100). He gives (pp. 136-45) a useful bibliography of works concerned with music. His conclusion is that the Ronsard of the *Amours à Cassandre* is (p. 275)

le lyrique passionné du sonnet décasyllabique à se chanter à soi-même ou à faire chanter sur le luth et qui sonne . . . l'heure de sa jeunesse amoureuse, l'heure émouvante de la première jeunesse du lyrisme français.

M. Desonay's book has made already and doubtless will make in its second and third parts an important contribution to studies of the French sixteenth century.<sup>1</sup>

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

---

<sup>1</sup> On p. 62 M. Desonay accepts the opinion of Laumonier and Chamard in dating the poet's birth, "nuit du samedi 10 au dimanche 11 septembre 1524." This effort to reconcile Ronsard's statements that he was born on Saturday and on September 11, which fell on Sunday, has always struck me as a political rather than a scholarly compromise. Most men know the day of the month on which they were born, while few know the day of the week. The evidence points to Sunday, September 11; the statement that he was born on Saturday should be considered the poet's error.

*Deutsche Realisten des 19. Jahrhunderts.* By GEORG LUKÁCS.  
Bern: A. Francke, 1951. 308 pp. S. Fr. 19.-

*Deutsche Realisten* begins where *Goethe und seine Zeit* (1947) leaves off. It is also a part of Lukács' comprehensive study of the literature of the 19th Century (*Der russische Realismus in der Weltliteratur*, 1948; *Balzac und der französische Realismus*, 1952; etc.). The volume under review contains both more and less than the title promises. It includes studies of Keller, Raabe, and Fontane. The transition is represented by Heine and Büchner. The essays on Kleist and Eichendorff are to indicate the continuity of the literary tradition (or the lack thereof). Lukács would have liked to include Hoffmann and Hebbel; regretfully he pleads lack of opportunity. Not even mention is made of the Austrian writers, and no explanation is offered as to why their work fails to engage the critic's interest.

Lukács' favored form of expression is the essay. He has written voluminously, yet there is only one work, *Der junge Hegel* (1948), which does not fit this category. Strange indeed that he who, with supreme assurance, claims that only an orthodox Marxist can treat a problem in an understanding, comprehensive, and systematic fashion, should be as much of an essayist as any bourgeois thinker who cannot possibly possess the power of integration.

The reader is invited to focalize upon what Lukács considers the outstanding trait of a writer and is then shown how it endows his work with its particular significance. Kleist is lonely, isolated all around, and despite all efforts incapable of breaking the ring of steel that holds him captive. And Lukács explains: "Das Kleistsche Grunderlebnis ist freilich an sich (von Kleist selbst nie begriffen) der Stellung des Menschen zur Gesellschaft im Kapitalismus entsprungen." (p. 22) "An sich" is dialectical gobbledegook and explains nothing; actually, it does less than that. The "an sich" of loneliness in the capitalist society signifies potentiality. It ought to be shown then, how this An-sich-sein could and did become a human actuality, but Lukács fails to do this. Had he been less dogmatic, he could have pointed out that a society in decline and a transitional period create conditions which may cause an individual to lose all sense of "belonging." It would be unfair, however, to say or even to imply that Lukács is always narrowly and distortingly dogmatic. The example has been adduced to show how the erudite Lukács sometimes flounders on the rock of preconception. On the other hand, he is always worth watching when his aesthetic sensibilities come into play, when he comes to grips with the literary work itself. His major point—Kleist initiating the "Privatisierung des Dramas" (p. 39)—is well taken.

The essay on Büchner calls for a word of explanation. It contains an attack on the late Karl Viëtor. Lukács considers the victim of his polemic a Fascist and, therefore, as lacking in scholarly integrity.

This fact caused the publishers discomfort and made them apprehensive lest the publication of the present volume be misunderstood. The attack was uncalled for, of course. However, it may appear less preposterous if not less excusable, if it is remembered that Lukács' polemic was written in 1937 and is, therefore, not directed against *Georg Büchner als Politiker* (1939) or even *Georg Büchner* (1949). The object of the attack is Viëtor's article "Die Tragödie des heldischen Pessimismus. Über Büchners Drama 'Dantons Tod'" (DVj. xii, 1934). The fact that Viëtor's article was published in 1934 while he was still in Germany, caused Lukács' political suspicion; his critical ire was aroused by the geistesgeschichtliche formalism of the article itself. Viëtor must have recognized that this study is neither very substantial nor very penetrating, because his chapter on *Dantons Tod* in his study of Büchner bears but the faintest resemblance to the disputed article. It is difficult to see why the publishers did not insist on Lukács' taking cognizance of these facts or why, in case he balked, they did not produce them themselves.<sup>1</sup>

The most satisfactory study contained in *Deutsche Realisten* deals with Gottfried Keller. Here Lukács not only thoroughly analyses the narrative forms but also the failure of Keller's attempt at the drama. The reader finds also in this study (one is almost inclined to say: inevitably) statements, or rather averments, which will give him pause. "Der Feuerbach-Schüler Keller kennt und gestaltet sehr genau die Macht der gesellschaftlichen Verhältnisse." (p. 177) Or: "Dennoch wäre ohne die Jahre in Heidelberg, ohne die Berührung mit der Feuerbachschen Philosophie niemals eine wirkliche epische Totalität entstanden." (p. 204). Nobody will deny that Keller knew the force of social conditions and that he created an "epic totality." It is very doubtful, however, that he learned all this from Feuerbach. Lukács' assertion is very strange even in its own, the Marxian right. It may be remembered that his supreme authorities, though praising Feuerbach, nevertheless and particularly, criticized the latter's lack of social awareness and penetration. But the idea was so neat (from the Marxian point of view): Feuerbach, one of the outstanding bourgeois philosophers, was instrumental in Keller's attaining one of the peaks of bourgeois literature.

GERHARD LOOSE

University of Colorado

---

<sup>1</sup> The chickens came home to roost. In 1949/50, Lukács was sharply attacked by the Party zealots. The charges were "rightist deviation" and failure to popularize Soviet literature. For a summary of the "debate," cf. Révai, József. *Lukács and Soviet Realism*. London, 1950. The accused publicly recanted and hastened to make amends. *Der russische Realismus in der Weltliteratur* has been doubled in volume and now (3rd edition, 1951) contains a part entitled "Der sozialistische Realismus."

*Goethe the Alchemist. A Study of Alchemical Symbolism in Goethe's Literary and Scientific Works.* By RONALD D. GRAY. Cambridge: University Press, 1952. Pp. x + 312. \$7.00.

The subtitle indicates the approach and content of this elaborate tabulation of possible alchemist thought-patterns in Goethe's works. Different from a recent study by Professor Jantz, which limited itself to Renaissance connotations in *Faust*, Mr. Gray attempts to show that the symbols, concepts and forms of thinking common to alchemical and mystical writings actually determined Goethe's entire scientific production and a great part of his poetic and philosophical work. There are three divisions: *Alchemy, Science, Life and Literature*, and a *Conclusion* with added lists of references, a bibliography, and an index. Three plates and one text illustration are given besides.

Part I contains a chapter on alchemical books that Goethe read or might have read or heard of, a chapter on Boehme and Alchemy (even though there is only one verifiable reference to Boehme in Goethe's works), and a third chapter: From Alchemy to Science. Part II discusses the *Metamorphosis of Plants*, the theory of colors, anatomy, geology and meteorology in three chapters, and comprises about one third of the entire volume. The third part deals with the *Märchen*, the theme of *Center and Circle*, Homunculus, and revealing references to *Male and Female*.

In his discussion of Goethe's geology (p. 145) the author observes that his method implies a certain distortion, since he must single out possible alchemist connotations and somewhat disregard the main body of factual material that has no bearing on his study. Since Goethe spoke of his alchemist period with a slightly deprecatory tone, Mr. Gray had set himself the difficult task of proving alchemical influences by an indirect method of analogies between alchemical writings and Goethean thoughts. Others have tried to show by similar methods that Goethe owed much to Plotinus, to Shaftesbury, to Spinoza, and even to Swedenborg; Goethe himself named only Shakespeare, Spinoza and Linné. The question therefore arises: Did Goethe perhaps not know to whom he owed strong intellectual impulses? If, for example, he felt that his views of botany or his color theory were built upon observation of facts, are we to dispute his self-knowledge and interpret his theories anew, in the symbolic manner? There can be little doubt, of course, that Goethe's process of reasoning by analogy, his preoccupation with such simple thought-patterns as *Inside-Outside, Expansion-Contraction, One and All*, and his very search for all-inclusive and final "convictions" have many analogies in various mystical and alchemical, religious and philosophical authors; nor need we dispute the fact that Goethe was acquainted with the alchemical and mystic

tradition. But when one stipulates actual dependencies it cannot be enough to mark certain similarities between Goethe and others. First of all, poetic genius which is constantly at work on symbolic representation and self-expression is not a derivative phenomenon, and, besides, it was not felt to be derivative by Goethe. If proof for dependence is required it would seem necessary therefore logically to eliminate the independent creative power of Goethe and to reduce his thinking to early readings. Is it not just as plausible to assume that the imaginations and formative urges present in pre-scientific speculation were *originally* present in Goethe's creative activity? A solution of this question would require a study of Goethe's psychology, and above all of his psychological theory and practice, while the assumption of Jung's speculations can add little that is not extraneous to the subject.

Thus it happens that Mr. Gray is constantly confusing analogies, that *he* can see and set down, with true relationship. But whenever a proof is needed we are given a mere possibility. He proceeds by guesses, a matter which was thoroughly displeasing to Goethe when he saw it at work in Creuzer. His aversion to such symbolic interpretations, which he shared with Voss, attests to a strongly rational and pictorial component of his mind. Mr. Gray, on the other hand, abounds with surmise: "It is moreover reasonably certain that Goethe was made aware of this significance of the *Magnum Opus* by his guide into the mysteries of alchemy, Fräulein von Klettenberg" (p. 22). "Jean de Bernières Louvigni, whom Goethe probably read at Strasbourg" (p. 25) and so on, throughout the book, e. g. pp. 38, 52 f., 65, 66, 67, etc. Such assumptions may be *believed*, but they constitute no scientific contribution even if the resulting picture attains a systematic unity and seemingly confirms itself. That is called begging the question. At times, the author became aware of his tenuous hold on reality: "The interpretation of Homunculus offered in this chapter treats him solely from the point of view of alchemical notions. It assumes that Goethe interpreted the symbol as it is interpreted here, and shows that he conveyed the same meaning in dramatic form in *Faust*." (p. 219) But when he then continues: "This approach is valuable in that it reveals what is likely to have been in Goethe's mind as he wrote," we must put our foot down. "Likely" is definitely the wrong word and amounts to a complete confusion as to what constitutes a proof.

There is one other weakness. The author's information in the sciences is unfortunately derivative and not bolstered by much knowledge of the history of the various disciplines. Even a rudimentary acquaintance with the history of nineteenth century scientific work in physiology, color theory, morphology must reveal that many of the leading scientists, men who established entire



disciplines, discovered to their surprise that some of their fundamental concepts had been anticipated by Goethe. Again, the somewhat cavalierly treatment of Hering in Mr. Gray's reference is thoroughly out of order, and the discussion which a contemporary scientist of the rank of Koehler gave of Goethe's contributions to the physiology of seeing (University of Pennsylvania Goethe lectures) shows, as one of many examples that could be cited, that the expert is often much less critical than the amateur or outsider to the field.

These strictures do not mean that the book is without value. It is often quite stimulating and contains much that is thoroughly sound. The reviewer was particularly gratified to find here an independent confirmation of his findings about the physiological aspects of Goethe's botany and particularly about the question of a-sexual reproduction. (It might be added that, while Goethe's *Metamorphose* seems to rely largely on dycotyletons, his concept of a-sexual reproduction and proliferation must have derived, as a drawing of a stooling grass shows, from a wider field of observations.) The tenth chapter, *Male and Female*, is a most valuable contribution to the understanding of Goethe. Here the analogies do not matter much, because the material itself is valid. A great number of references to Sisters, *Amazonen*, Mignon, and the like are brought together in the tradition of similar studies by Willoughby and Fairley, to which I added the *Sturz* and *Mitternacht* themes. It would seem that such motif studies would offer a much sounder entry into Goethe's conscious and unconscious mind than argumentations on possible or even likely analogies to mystical alchemism, which after all may be merely in the mind of a writer particularly versed in this field of study. Since Mr. Gray has an unusual thoroughness and an enviable grasp of facts and of Goethe's work as well as a commendable, if prematurely suppressed, self-criticism, there should be little doubt that future contributions of his will escape the logical pitfalls inherent in the methods of analogical reasoning.

HEINRICH MEYER

Muhlenberg College

---

*Goethe's Botanical Writings.* Transl. by BERTHA MUELLER. With an Introduction by CHARLES J. ENGARD. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1952. Pp. 258. \$5.00.

This is a beautiful book, well illustrated, excellently and competently annotated, and lovingly conceived. The original suggestion for this translation came from a botanist, Professor Engard. He wrote an introduction which shows an exceptional grasp of

Goethe's botanical work but also of Goethe's entire creative personality. When the translator discovered that Dr. Agnes Arber's translation of Goethe's *Metamorphosis* was under way, a generous exchange of letters between the two students of Goethe's botany took place and the work continued. The introduction overemphasizes perhaps somewhat the morphological aspect of Goethe's studies and underrates the general and the physiological components in the theory; but, of course, this is partly due to Goethe himself who gradually came to stress his morphology at the expense of wider and often more intimate, even biographical, elements such as we discern in his poem on the *Metamorphosis of Plants*. The only other weakness I can discover is the absence of some samples from Goethe's diaries, which would have successfully put to rest such vague aspersions by inexpert critics like Sherrington that Goethe only speculated. He experimented in various fields of botanical research and made precise laboratory notes, among which the most startling is, no doubt, that of the discovery of an antibiotic action of *Boletus* and *Piper* extracts. But apart from this understandable omission, the book will prove a most useful introduction to Goethe's botanical work for both the interested layman and scholar and the Goethe students in our universities who cannot yet read the original works.

The book contains not only the *Metamorphose der Pflanzen* in a splendid independent translation that gives the full feeling of an original, but also numerous extracts from *Zur Naturwissenschaft überhaupt, besonders zur Morphologie*, which appeared from 1817 till 1824 and contained a great part of Goethe's botanical writings. Thus we now have *Formation and Transformation of Organic Natures*, *Intuitive Judgment*, *Notes for an Essay on Plant Culture in the Duchy of Weimar*, *On Smut, Blight and Honeydew*, besides numerous book reviews and other articles in reliable and truly beautiful translations that bring to the reader's mind not only Goethe's own diction, but also a sense of gratification over so much devotion and loving care on the part of the translator. In addition to strictly botanical writings, some autobiographical papers and some philosophical analyses of Goethe's are included. A short biographical table, bibliographical notes and a selected bibliography conclude this book. It is to be hoped that it will soon appear on every Goethe shelf and be utilized in *Faust* classes and Goethe courses as it should.

HEINRICH MEYER

Muhlenberg College

---

*Beruf und Arbeit in deutscher Erzählung*, ein literarisches Lexikon.

Bearb. v. FRANZ ANSELM SCHMITT. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1952. Pp. xvi + 668.

Eines dieser höchst nützlichen Bücher, die man nicht liest, aber täglich zur Hand nimmt. Es dient der Wissenschaftsorganisation, der schnellen Orientierung, der literaturkundlichen Technologie und ersetzt einen Schlagwortkatalog. Die 'Helden' der neuen deutschen Literatur sind nach ihren Berufen geordnet und innerhalb der Berufsgattung nach Autoren bibliographisch verzeichnet; ein erklärendes Wort charakterisiert nötigenfalls den spezifischen Inhalt.

Mithilfe des Lexikons wäre es unschwer möglich, Verlagerungen der Berufsbewertung im modernen Roman historisch oder soziologisch oder auch landschaftskundlich zu verzeichnen: etwa vom Kaufmann zum Techniker zum Seelenarzt; oder vom Künstler, einem Favoriten des Bürgerromans der wilhelminischen Ära, zum Proleten (hier unter 'Arbeiter,' 'Industriearbeiter,' 'Landarbeiter'; 'Arbeitsloser' existiert nicht: Falladas *Kleiner Mann* steht optimistisch unter 'Verkäufer'); der Industrieroman findet in ostpreußischer Literatur keinen günstigen Boden, aber auch in Bayern nicht, sein Herzland sind die rheinischen Provinzen. 'Flugzeugführer' formen eine nicht viel stärkere Cadre als 'Krankenschwestern,' wobei sich aber nicht nur ergibt, daß den uniformierten Damen im ersten Viertel des Jahrhunderts der Vortritt gelassen ist, während die Sturzhelmträger sich in den letzten beiden Jahrzehnten breit machen, sondern daß für den Ruhm der Wohltäterinnen der Menschheit ziemlich ausschließlich die weibliche Feder gesorgt hat. — Schon bei spielerischem Blättern durch das Buch fühlt sich der Geist zu allerlei soziologisch-literarischen Studien angeregt, deren Tragfähigkeit allerdings dadurch beschränkt sein mag, daß grade das wichtigste Schrifttum durch die etwas zu groben Maschen des hier gewobenen bibliographischen Geflechts schlüpft: ThManns *Zauberberg* hat seinen Platz unter 'Lungenarzt,' Ingenieur, Schriftsteller, Offizier, Großkaufmann, Tiefenpsychologe gehen leer aus; hämischer Zufall, daß *Tonio Kröger* weder bei 'Bürger' noch auch bei 'Künstler' Unterkommen gefunden hat. Das Gleiche passierte Aschenbach und dem Professor Cornelius, dessen Historiker-Kostüm freilich zu dünn ist, um die Schriftsteller-Figur ThManns ganz zu verbergen.

Keinen Platz gefunden hat Musils *Mann ohne Eigenschaften*, da er zu 'Beruf und Arbeit' ein so kühles Verhältnis unterhält. Wahrscheinlich fällt er für Schmitt unter die *Asozialen*, die zusammen mit regierenden Fürsten, Soldaten, Rittern, Studenten, Berufssportlern und Polizeibeamten von der Bibliographie der Werktätigen ausgeschlossen sind. So daß es also hier weder einen Felix Krull gibt noch auch einen Leutnant von Trotha! Joseph Roth

ist überhaupt vernachlässigt und nur mit zwei unbeträchtlichen Sächelchen vertreten, was auch von Alfred Neumann gilt oder z. B. von Bruno Frank, dessen Briand-Novelle nicht hätte fehlen dürfen. Der Arzt Carossa ist mit drei 'Arzt'-Titeln vertreten, der Arzt Gottfried Benn nur mit den *Gehirnen*.

Statt aber auf unvermeidliche Lücken und Willkürlichkeiten der Auswahl hinzuweisen, sei der hilfswissenschaftliche Wert der entsagungsvollen Arbeit betont, deren sich die literaturkundliche Untersuchung mit Nutzen bedienen wird. Die drucktechnische Ausstattung ist, wie von Hiersemann zu erwarten, ausgezeichnet und läßt keine Wünsche übrig.

ARNO SCHIROKAUER

---

*Meister der Komödie von Aristophanes bis G. B. Shaw.* By HEINZ KINDERMANN. Wien-München: Donau-Verlag, 1952. Pp. 297, 16 Plates. DM. 18. 65.

Professor Kindermann, known by his works on Lenz, Raimund, and his recently published *Theatergeschichte der Goethezeit*, gives us in this new book a valuable study on the development and typology of the European comedy. The first part of the book deals with the basic forms of the comic theatre, the second with its vital function (*Lebensfunktion*) within the framework of occidental cultural life. We consider the first part the most important and original one. Starting out from Goethe's *aperçu*: "Gestaltenlehre ist Verwandlungslehre," the author applies the morphological method, which seems to be gaining more and more ground in recent German literary criticism. He arrives thus at a typology in which the types of comedy are no longer handled as static categories of an ordering intellect, but shown in their vital growth, organic interrelation and metamorphosis embedded in the matrix of human existence. Based on *Petsch's* views on the bipolarity of drama in general, *comos* and *mimos* are discussed as the basic types underlying the different forms of comedy. The *comos*, of ritual origin, leads to the higher manifestations of comedy in which the conflicts resulting from the tragic duality of life are dissolved in a superior play on them. From the *comos*-type the author derives three homologous basic series (*Grundreihen*): 1) the theatrical travesty of the extra- or supra-human, leading to the phantastic or fairy-tale-like comedy (Aristophanes, Shakespeare, Romantic comedy, Raimund); 2) the caricature of interhuman relations (Plautus, Lessing, Lenz, French social comedy); 3) a polemical comedy directed against political and social evils (Aristophanes, drama of the Reformation, Molière's *Tartuffe*, Lenz's *Soldaten*, Büchner, Gogol, Shaw, Brecht, Th. Wilder). The imitative and playful *mimos*, amoral in nature and characterized by a "vital realism,"

which *Petsch* contrasted as "*Theaterstück*" with the "*geistiges Drama*" is joined in various proportions with the *comos*-type, but finds its purest realization in the *commedia dell' arte* and the popular comedy of Old-Vienna. After pointing out the crucial place of Menander's comedy, which introduced character and incorporated elements of Euripidean tragedy into comic drama, the author distinguishes two basic forms of character-comedy: 1) the *statariae*, representing and unmasking characters, leading to Molière and Holberg; 2) the *motoriae*, where an intrigue is carried on (Scribe etc.).

The second, historical part of the book, dealing with the "masters of comedy" does not fully live up to the expectations aroused by the preceding general discussion. In general scope the book agrees with Henry Ten Eyck Perry's *Masters of Dramatic Comedy and their Social Themes* (Cambridge, 1939), but differs from the latter in the manner of treatment, and, quite naturally, in the selections. While Perry omits Shakespeare for methodological reasons and leaves out Lenz, Büchner, Eichendorff, and Hauptmann (alluded to only in a footnote), Kindermann, writing for a German public includes the latter. Strangely enough both authors mention the English Restoration Comedy only in passing. Comparing the two books it may be said that Perry gives a more detailed analysis of the individual plays, Kindermann a more pointed and thought-provoking characterization of the authors' importance. This is easily explained by the different methods and goals of the two critics. Both reflect changing trends in literary criticism. Perry is interested in the social themes expressed or implied in comedy; Kindermann, adopting a morphological interpretation, is searching for the existential roots of comedy and the manifold forms (metamorphoses) it has developed. According to Kindermann, comedy and tragedy are intimately related to each other in that both start out from the conviction of a discrepancy between the ideal and the real and from the ambiguity of all human existence. Comedy, in contrast to tragedy, reacts to this rift in a satirical or humorous way, offering in laughter a refuge and catharsis, calming human anxieties in the consciousness that we all are accomplices ("*Mitschuldige*") in an imperfect world. To have stated this vital—or shall we say "existential"—function of comedy especially for our troubled age is one of the merits of Kindermann's book, in which it supplements Bergson's and Meredith's attempts to fathom the comic and comedy. Although a list of errata was added to the book we found the following (here corrected) misprints: p. 149, Anm. 1: Nationallit.; p. 112, l. 17: Aurispa; p. 162, l. 18: fruchtbarer; p. 188, l. 24: doppelzüngig; p. 212, l. 20: eigenartig; p. 282, l. 8: Pedanterie; in p. 85 there seems to be a mix-up of foot-notes: n. 1 probably belonging to p. 84 as n. 2, and n. 2 on p. 85 to be read as n. 1.

HEINZ MOENKEMEYER

University of Pennsylvania

*Twentieth-Century German Verse.* A Selection Translated by HERMAN SALINGER. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952. Pp. xxiii, 93. \$2.50.

Mr. Salinger presents here, in a bi-lingual edition, an anthology of forty-two poems selected from the works of twenty-one poets, ranging from Isolde Kurz and Ricarda Huch as the earliest writers to Albrecht Haushofer, Ulrich Becher, and Hans Egon Holthusen as the latest ones. Rainer Maria Rilke and Herman Hesse receive the most attention, with eight poems each; Christian Morgenstern and Hermann Claudius come next with three poems apiece. Stefan George is represented by only two poems because his work is already available in English translation. The introduction by the translator discusses the nature and aims of the anthology and gives brief comments on some of the poets and poems included in the book.

The translator freely admits in his introduction that he selected poems which had a strong personal appeal for him and which "yearned to be reborn in English." (p. xiii) Even granting the right of a translator to make his own selections, one still can not help but regret the inclusion of mediocre poems, such as Ina Seidel's "Ehe" and Franz Werfel's "Ich bin ein erwachsener Mensch," and one wonders why Hofmannsthal, whom the translator himself includes in the "great triumvirate" of modern German poets, is represented only by "Grossmutter und Enkel," certainly not one of his best poems. Far more serious, however, than any faults in the selection of the poems is the weakness of the translations. There is scarcely a poem in the whole collection but is marred by an extremely awkward line, the use of word order which sounds German rather than English, or an unpleasant irregularity of meter, not to mention inadequacies of translation or occasional gross distortions of meaning. Only a few of the translations are passable, as for instance those of a few of the Hesse group, "Manchmal," "Nacht," "Allein," "Bücher." The translator's stated aim (p. xxiii) of preserving the thought-content of the poems intact, as well as the original form, or at least giving the poems an equivalent form in our prosody, has unfortunately not been achieved. The defects are so numerous that it is impossible in a brief review to mention more than a few. The third line of Rilke's poem, "O sage, Dichter, was du tust?—Ich rühme," which reads, "wie hältst du's aus, wie nimmst du's hin?—Ich rühme," Mr. Salinger translates as "how do you take it, how resist?—I praise." The English expression "take it" is too colloquial to be really appropriate in this poem, and the use of the word "resist" perverts the meaning of the line, for Rilke uses no such antithesis between acceptance and resistance. The translation of lines six and seven of the same poem is even worse. They read in German: "Woher dein Recht, in jeglichem



Kostüme, / in jeder Maske wahr zu sein?—Ich rühme." The English version is: "What right is yours, in all these varied ways, / under a thousand masks yet true?—I praise." Here the translation does not even make sense, to say nothing of the triteness of the phrase "in all these varied ways." In the translation of Georg Trakl's "Romanze zur Nacht" the translator introduces a note of humor, involuntary, I suspect, in such lines as "The murderer drinks his wine wide-eyed" for "Der Mörder lächelt bleich im Wein," and "A nun prays nude with bated breath" for "Die Nonne betet wund und nackt," and in rhyming "lunatic" with "love-sick." The use of an expression like "with bated breath" is a good example of two of the most frequent defects of these translations, the tendency to use shop-worn clichés and to fill out a line with a phrase which does not correspond even to the spirit of the German original. The first two lines and a half of Haushofer's sonnet "In Fesseln," which reads: "Für den, der nächtlich in ihr schlafen soll, / so kahl die Zelle schien, so reich an Leben / sind ihre Wände," are translated as: "Bare though it seemed at first, this close-built cell / when nightly sleep might knit care's raveled sleeve, / its walls are teeming." The borrowing from Shakespeare is unfair to Haushofer, to the reader who knows no German, and, last but not least, to Shakespeare himself, who might well resent the alterations which destroy the melody of the line as Shakespeare wrote it. The word "when" would make sense only if there were a comma after "cell," and the omission of anything in the English which corresponds to "an Leben" gives the phrase "its walls are teeming" an ambiguity with very unpleasant and unsuitable implications.

There are also a number of instances of metrical clumsiness, a fault which is particularly disturbing in the translations of strict forms like the sonnet, where the English versions convey no impression of the technical facility and regularity of the German originals, as for instance in the translations of the two sonnets by Haushofer and the sonnet "Hingabe" by Holthusen.

HELEN MUSTARD

Columbia University

---

*Moby-Dick*. By HERMAN MELVILLE, edited by LUTHER S. MANSFIELD and HOWARD P. VINCENT. New York: Hendricks House, 1952. Pp. lii + 851.

No one will oppose the editors' claim that "no other American novel has ever received such liberal annotation." Professors Mansfield and Vincent have done a prodigious job of research, conscien-

tiously studying not merely everything that Melville is known to have read or written but also innumerable books that he might have read or that might have influenced him indirectly. The product is 260 pages of notes that point out in great detail correspondences between Melville and Carlyle, Hawthorne, the Bible, Emerson, Sir Thomas Browne, Shakespeare, De Quincey, Goethe, Southey, and books on whaling, as well as a host of minor sources. Many references are simple citations; perhaps just as many consist of long quotations from the sources. The editors have outlined the characteristic pattern of Melville's allusions by citing similar allusions in his letters, journals, and other works. They have shown where all the omissions in the bowdlerized first English edition occur. In the introduction they have supplied a useful history of the composition and reputation of *Moby Dick*. An index to the notes and introduction lists Melville's certain or probable sources, analyses of major characters, and a few subject headings, like "Democracy," "Fate," and "Whiteness." A vast amount of information, most of it available nowhere else, is assembled in this volume. As one instrument for understanding Melville's mind and creative methods, for teaching, or for carrying forward research, this edition of *Moby Dick* is of great value.

The virtues of the volume make the task of pointing out its defects odious. But because it is intended to be the definitive text, it invites searching criticism. Why is the hyphen retained in the title when the usage is *Moby Dick* throughout the first edition? It seems clear that the hyphen in the original title is not Melville's work at all, but that of his brother Allan, who conducted the negotiations with the publishers. Melville omits the hyphen in his letters; Allan uses it. A random check with the first edition reveals at least four misprints in the new text. The treatment of Melville's errors is inconsistent. Sometimes they are corrected, with a note indicating the original reading. At other points they are noted but allowed to stand. But Melville's error of "Cabaco's" for "Archy's" (228) is neither corrected nor noted, and inconsistencies in spelling remain unchanged: "Cook" and "Cooke" (108), "prairie" (192) and "Praire" (343), "Enderbys" (440) and "Enderbies" (441), "Bhering's" (62) and "Behring's" (457), "fowl" and "fowels" (539). In combination with the two dozen errors or misprints in the notes, these defects create unfortunate doubts about reliability.

On the whole the notes are both good and necessary. Yet many policies and methods seem regrettable. Scores of notes belabor trivial points, range far from the subject, or have little apparent relevance. Unfruitful speculation, tenuous logic, a determination, it seems, to find sources at any cost, and even wild guesses mark far too many notes. The possibility that Melville drew much of his information from common knowledge or experience is pretty

generally overlooked. The problem of distinguishing between factual and interpretative notes has been inadequately handled.

The publisher has done little to reward the patient labors of the editors. The thick paper is an especially poor choice in a book that runs to 851 pages, the format is undistinguished, and the publisher has failed in his obligation to catch errors overlooked by the hard-working editors. It is disappointing that the greatest product of Melville's genius has been allowed to appear in an edition that does no credit to American publishing.

WILLIAM H. GILMAN

*The University of Rochester*

---

*Två Kapitel Engelsk Grammatik.* By H. W. DONNER. Helsingfors: Söderström & Co., 1951. Pp. 105.

Professor Donner, newly appointed to the chair of English language and literature at Uppsala, is here concerned with two vexing matters in English grammar—the use of *shall* and *will* and the position of adverbs. The discussion is addressed to Swedish students and teachers of English. The aim is to give them practical help with their own usage and to provide a clearer understanding of how and why standard usage varies. To this end a number of rules are formulated which are succinct and clear, and also prescriptive in the main and rather oversimplified. The discussion indicates that Professor Donner has considered the work of Poutsma, Jespersen, Curme, Fries, and others who have dealt with these matters more thoroughly, and has incorporated some of their ideas and findings. By and large, however, he avoids consideration of many complexities of actual usage and much that is difficult to explain. This is understandable and pretty much a matter of necessity in view of the practical aim. Swedish students should find the work stimulating and helpful, but they will also continue to have trouble with their *shall's* and *will's* and the placement of their adverbs.

Briefly, the method and scope are as follows. To clarify *shall* and *will* usage, this scheme is first (p. 19) proposed:

1. In expressing pure futurity, *shall* is used in the first person and *will* in the second and third.
2. In expressing volition, *will* is used in all three persons.
3. In expressing obligation, *shall* is used in all three persons.
4. In certain subordinate clauses, *should* is used in all three persons.

Each of these propositions is then restated more fully. The rule for pure futurity, for example (p. 30), takes into account actual and conditional future, main and subordinate clauses, negations,

and questions. These distinctions are explained and exemplified. Most of the examples merely illustrate what the rule prescribes. When, as in a few instances, the rule and example are at variance, this is briefly commented on. The fourth rule (p. 54) is somewhat complicated and its subcategories involve a good deal of overlapping. In the preliminary discussion (pp. 11-32) an attempt is made to explain the diversity of present day usage by considering the historical development of *shall* and *will* together with some psychological and philosophical factors that may have been influential. Nothing new is advanced, and it seems to me that Jespersen's (*A Modern English Grammar* iv, 290-300) is a better brief treatment of trends and causes, and Fries's (*American English Grammar*, p. 159 ff.) better on actual usage.

In the treatment of adverbs there is not much attempt to explain why their position varies, i. e. to provide a general overview as Curme (*Syntax*, ¶ 16. 2), for example, does. Nor does the author succeed as well as in the discussion of *shall* and *will* in clarifying the matter for students. What he does is to provide a rule for the position of each of seven kinds of adverbs: sentence, degree, quantifying, manner, time, place, and negative. Each kind is explained, the more commonly used adverbs of each are listed, and a few illustrative sentences cited. An interesting feature is the use of tables (23 in all) to illustrate the varying position of these different kinds of adverbs in different constructions, i. e. simple and compound verbs, active and passive, questions, etc. The sentence *blind cats catch little mice* is used, and in some instances rather ludicrous usages result, e. g. *little mice are certainly not half caught by blind cats* (p. 86). But students may find the device helpful, for it visualizes if it doesn't explain what is indeed a very puzzling and difficult matter in syntax for those who do not speak English as their native tongue.

NORMAN E. ELIASON

University of North Carolina

---

*The Structure of English. An Introduction to the Construction of English Sentences.* By CHARLES CARPENTER FRIES. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 1952. Pp. ix + 304. \$4.00.

Everyone seriously concerned with the teaching of English grammar will have to read Professor Fries's book. In a way no other work successfully does, it both lucidly reveals the general method and aim of the "new grammarians," i. e. the structuralists, and shows how this method is applicable to grammatical study on the

high school and college levels. To readers unacquainted with modern linguistic work—and it is intended primarily for them—his book will be provocative, informative, and also disconcerting, for it vigorously attacks and uncompromisingly condemns the traditional grammar taught in the schools, and proposes as the alternative a system of grammar that will seem radically different. Readers familiar with the point of view and method used in a number of more technical studies from Bloomfield's *Language* through Harris's *Methods in Structural Linguistics* will be interested in seeing to what extent and how Fries has applied these in a book clearly intended to inaugurate a reform in the teaching of grammar. In the main, it seems to me, he does an admirable job of explaining and using much of a type of grammatical analysis which is virtually unknown except to linguistic specialists, but succeeds less well in demonstrating that the necessary reform can be effected only by adopting this type of analysis.

Much of what Fries has to say about the faults of traditional grammar is entirely sound. In concentrating his attack on school grammars, however, he oversimplifies what is really a complex issue. His remarks (cf. especially 277) suggest that everything wrong in them is due to their "false orientation," i.e. in proceeding from meaning to form, and that it is therefore necessary to adopt the opposite procedure, i.e. from form to meaning. It would be more judicious, I think, to point out that among competent linguistic scholars both procedures have their advocates and practitioners, that both have their merits and defects, and that it is possible and practicable to use both. The choice of procedures, in so far as school grammars are concerned, is not solely dependent on the superior or exclusive scientific validity claimed for the one, but also on their relative effectiveness in achieving practical results. "The chief value" of the "new grammar," Fries rightly says, "is the insight it can give concerning the way our language works, and through English, into the nature and functioning of human languages" (296). Among the other values claimed for it—not very convincingly I feel—the traditional one of "learning to speak and write correctly" is not listed. Since many of the readers to whom this book is addressed consider this the chief value of grammar study, it needs more than the passing mention given it (e.g. 5-6, 274, 290).

The structural analysis has some intentional restrictions and limitations which should be noted. It is introductory and hence illustrative rather than exhaustive. It is incomplete, a later study of aspect and tense being promised. It is based on a limited but adequate amount of spoken material, and the fact that this is telephone conversation introduces some special and in a sense unnecessary complications. It is concerned mainly though not exclusively

with syntactical matters, but much that is commonly treated under syntax is not dealt with at all or only sketchily.

The analysis may be said to consist of three parts. The first (chapters 2-4 and 8) deals with the sentence as a unit—its definition (Bloomfield's is relied on), its delimitation (The precise method is not clear, 39-40), its kinds (The principal ones are *questions*, *requests*, and *statements*), and the different structural patterns marking these kinds (Word order, intonation, and various *function words* are the main distinguishing features, though context figures too). The second (chapters 5-7) takes up parts of speech, and proposes, as has often been done before, a more logically satisfactory classification than the traditional one. Four major parts of speech and fifteen groups of function words (154 in all) are distinguished. The four parts of speech, called *Class I words*, *Class II words*, etc. correspond roughly but not exactly to nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs. The function words include prepositions, conjunctions, interjections, some pronouns and auxiliary verbs. Difference in structural function (i. e. as tested by substitution in the same or comparable sentences) is the main basis of distinction, though for the four parts of speech (but not the function words) other criteria (e. g. morphological differences) are also used. The last part deals with sentence components. Chapter 9 shows how contrasting structural arrangement (illustrated by fifteen formulas) distinguishes subject, object, objective complement, and the like. Chapter 10 discusses modifiers, and chapter 11 subordinate clauses (very briefly) as well as the devices used to link sentences. Chapter 12 is concerned with the means for effecting word grouping.

NORMAN E. ELIASON

*University of North Carolina*

---

*T. S. Eliot et la France.* Par EDWARD J. H. GREENE. Paris: Boivin. n. d. Pp. 248.

There are certain things which the educated reader suspects when he is reading and which he does not bother to prove. Thus one does not have to have proof that Shakespeare had read North's Plutarch or that Shelley knew Greek. These are the things which are grist to the scholar's mill and many a doctoral dissertation has been written to prove what common knowledge has already discovered. Mr. Greene's book is a case in point. It seems incredible that anyone who had ever read *Prufrack* would not have heard the echoes of Laforgue or that anyone who had ever read the critical essays should not have heard the voice of Irving Babbitt resounding in them. But Mr. Greene with amazing patience has gone through the poetry and prose of Eliot line by line, indeed word by word,



and shown what is owing to Laforgue, Rimbaud, Babbitt, Maurras, and even Jacques Maritain. He has done the job with such thoroughness that it will never have to be done again. But he has proved almost too much.

For when one has finished reading his study, a study by the way written with constant advice from Mr. Eliot, one emerges with the feeling that the latest Nobel Prize winner is above all an imitator, an adapter, if not something less laudatory. It is true that Mr. Greene keeps telling us that Mr. Eliot has made these borrowings his own. For instance in *La Figlia che Piange* we read, "Simple and faithless as a smile and shake of the hand," and in Laforgue's *Pétition*, "*Simple et sans foi comme un bonjour*." Has Mr. Eliot made this simile his own or has he simply translated it? In the critical essays both literary and philosophic, we find few phrases as clearly reproduced as this, but almost every idea turns out to have been borrowed from Rémy de Gourmont, Benda, Irving Babbitt, Maurras and so on. Babbitt was of course corrected, since Mr. Eliot has little faith in the power of human beings to discipline themselves, though his faith has spread to ideas more difficult to accept. And Babbitt was moreover heavily dependent on his French predecessors. Mr. Greene quite properly, in view of his purpose, is more interested in Babbitt's sources than in Babbitt. It would appear then that both Mr. Eliot's form and content are taken from others.

This, I say, is proving too much. From Chaucer down to our own times—with the possible exception of the contemporary American novel—England and the United States have gone to the Continent for their culture. There is nothing either surprising or wrong in this. Everyone goes to someone else for everything, in science, in philosophy, and in the arts. The question which the historian must face is not only that of what a person has taken from another person, but that of what he has done with his borrowings. Mr. Greene may be said to have illustrated the dependence of a poet and critic upon his predecessors and perhaps to have permitted his readers to make up their own minds about the second question. But here is a writer whose impact upon the minds of his contemporaries has been tremendous. Has that been because of our ignorance of his sources? Has it been because he has reinterpreted the symbols and the ideas for which they stand in a new way? There is some likelihood that the answer to this question is affirmative. But if one looks for the new way in Mr. Greene's book, one will be disappointed. One cannot blame him for not writing the book which one would have liked to write oneself. But one can properly ask what was the use of writing the book which he did write.

GEORGE BOAS

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

*The Parisian Stage. Alphabetical Indexes of Plays and Authors. Part II (1816-1830).* By CHARLES BEAUMONT WICKS. University, Ala.: University of Ala. Press, 1953. Pp. viii + 107. (University of Alabama Studies, 8.)

Part I (1800-1815) appeared in 1950 and was reviewed in *MLN*, LXVI, 287-8. Part II resembles it, but is somewhat larger, includes corrections of the earlier work, and has changed its color from red to green. Based chiefly on *Soleinne*, Joannidès, Barbier, the *Journal des Débats*, the *Moniteur universel*, and other catalogues and journals, it lists over three thousand plays and operas that were first performed in Parisian theaters in the years indicated. A list of the authors concerned and a bibliography are added. The collection has been carefully made and well printed. It should be most useful to students of the modern stage in France. It would have profited if the author had examined Goizet's *Dictionnaire universel du théâtre en France*, though the published portion of that alphabetical compilation ends with the title *Dardanus*.<sup>1</sup> Most of the plays that appear there, however, are either mentioned by Mr. Wicks, or would have been excluded by him on the ground that there is no evidence that they were acted in a Parisian theater. It is a pleasure to add that Mr. Wicks is now at work on Part III and hopes to have it come down as far as 1850.

H. C. LANCASTER

---

<sup>1</sup> Wicks mentions *A qui est-il?*, but he names no authors; these are indicated by Goizet as Lafontaine and Caron de Maurecourt. Wicks omits the following plays, acted at the Funambules: *l'Agérien ou les Enfants abandonnés* by Frédéric Bellery, acted on Dec. 29, 1826; *Bacchus et l'Amour ou le Sacrifice de la rose*, acted on June 8, 1826; *la Chasse aux filles* by T. T., acted on Nov. 17, 1829; *le Château de Rendel ou le Spectre accusateur* by J. B. Drouin, acted on Oct. 30, 1823; *la Chaumière isolée ou les Brigands des Cévennes*, acted on Jan. 22, 1824; *les Chevaliers d'industrie*, acted on March 16, 1830. Wicks lists *l'Ami des enfans* without name of author or other date than the year 1825, whereas Goizet gives it as *Berquin ou l'Ami des enfans* by E. Vanderburch, acted on Aug. 27, 1824. Goizet adds *le Billet de cinq cents*, played at the theater of M. Comte on Feb. 25, 1823; *Blaise le Hargneux*, played at the Vaudeville on Oct. 14, 1822; *Chacun son tour*, an intermède by Auguste Imbert, played at the theater of M. Comte on Feb. 15, 1820. Goizet dates the production of *la Ceinture ou le Faux Astrologue* at the Opéra comique 1817 rather than 1818. He adds Feb. 3 to the date of *Céline*; Aug. 24 to that of the *Chaumière béarnaise*; the name of the author, M. J. Brisset, to the notice of *la Chambre jaune*; that of Emile Cottenet as author of *les Chiens savants*.

*Porgils saga ok Hafliða*. Edited by URSULA BROWN. Oxford University Press, 1952. Pp. lxiv + 105. Oxford English Monographs 3. General Editors J. R. R. Tolkien, F. P. Wilson, and Helen Gardner.

As only seven years have passed since Halldór Hermannsson published his edition of the saga in *Islandica* one cannot help putting the question whether this new edition was called for or not. But granted that it did not seem urgently wanted, one must at once admit that it will hold a worthy place not only beside Hermannsson's separate edition of the saga but also alongside the earlier editions incorporated in the *Sturlunga saga*. Miss Brown's definition of the saga as a literary piece of work is without any doubt superior to anything written before about it. The same goes for her treatment of the manuscripts, and her notes are fuller than Hermannsson's both on realia and language matters, a trait to be welcomed by English students as the language is often quite idiomatic and hard. Miss Brown points out more clearly than her predecessors the difference in style between this saga and the early secular sagas, a difference due, of course, to its Christian leanings, and she believes that the author probably learned a good bit of his style from *Sverris saga*, if he knew it at all, which seems not unlikely. Likewise she discounts the arguments of those who believe that the realistic details of the saga are due to an exceptionally faithful oral tradition by showing that such details are found even in places where one does not expect the old oral tale. In her opinion this characteristic everywhere is due to the imaginative author, who she thinks might have written the saga not "much earlier than 1237." She studies carefully the relationship of the saga to writings which the author might have known or which have borrowed from him: *Íslendingabók*, *Hungurvaka*, *Kristni saga*, *Landnámabók*, and *Ljósvetninga saga*, but, like all her predecessors, she fails to notice the fact that *Laxdæla saga* has obviously borrowed a motif from her saga (cf. my forthcoming note in *Skirnir* 1952). That does not militate against her dating, for *Laxdæla saga* has been dated ca. 1240 by arguments other than this loan.

Slips, misprints, or errors in Miss Brown's notes are surprisingly few. Such are *Fell inn innra* instead of *Fell ið innra* in note 2/14 p. 51; *skóggang* for *-gangr* in note 3/23 p. 56; *taka upp þykkjuna fyrir einhvern* in note 5/15 p. 58 does not mean 'to begin to be angry with someone' but 'to get angry on some one's account'; *prestssetr* read *prestsetr* in note 35/5-6 p. 88. There may be a couple of harmless misprints in addition to this. In the bibliography I miss references to Barði Guðmundsson's works which, though at times erratic, are sometimes quite brilliant.

Altogether the work reflects high credit on the editor and her sponsors at Oxford as well as on the Press. It is also gratifying as a sign of the high standard of Icelandic studies in England, due no doubt to the enthusiasm of Mr. Turville-Petre, editor of *Víga-Glúms saga*, the first to appear in this monograph series.

STEFÁN EINARSSON

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

*Les Lettres américaines devant la Critique française: 1887-1917.*

Par CYRILLE ARNAVON. Paris: Les Belles-Lettres, 1951.

Pp. vi + 159. (Annales de l'Université de Lyon, *Lettres*, III, 20.)

In many ways Professor Cyrille Arnavon's study is a humiliating but good book for Americans, for we like to think that we are better received abroad than we are. It is true that M. Arnavon warns us that French critics at the end of the last century were little competent to deal with alien literatures, and he cites some amusing examples, not only of their ignorance of our "frontier" literature but even of our country itself. One French critic assumed that Poe died in Richmond, another that Hamlin Garland was an employee of the Boston Public Library ("Among the Corn Rows" must have been located on the Common!), and even the great Rémy de Gourmont, as late as 1899, predicted the inevitable disintegration of our union because some parts of the country could not stand the bigoted Puritanism of other parts. A century after the Reverend Sydney Smith posed his annoying question ("Who reads an American book?"), French critics were generally disposed to respond with "un *non* massif" to the question, "Is there an American literature?" There were American writers—Poe, Whitman, Emerson, Twain, Hearn, and Masters appear to have been the best known in France in this time—but that we had a representative or distinct literature was not recognized. Régis Michaud could make a novel point by protesting in 1910 that it was "absurd to study . . . Longfellow or Henry James as if they were British."

No great French critic made a practice of considering American writers. Not Sainte-Beuve, Taine, Barbey d'Aurevilly, Scherer, Brunetière, Renan, Gourmont, Faguet, or Lemaître (the list is mine). Until Régis Michaud began to write, those who commented regularly on our letters in France were undistinguished and unendowed—persons like Thérèse Bentzon, Teodor de Wyzewa, and Arvède Barine. It is true that there were occasional special studies by men of perception or genius: M. Arnavon cites those of Doumic and Maeterlinck upon Emerson, of Gide and Schlumberger upon

Hearn, and of Ghéon upon Whitman. The treatment of Americans was dependent somewhat on translations of their work in France. Thus the fact that Henry James had only two novels and half a dozen of his shorter fictions translated in his lifetime may partially account for the little attention paid him in France—less than that accorded Hearn. But it was surprising to Frenchmen that Fenimore Cooper, translated for juveniles and well known there, should have been taken seriously as an artist by Brownwell and others. Melville, "whom Philarète Chasles had brilliantly introduced into France," is not mentioned in a single periodical examined by M. Arnavon. Prior to Bazalgette's translation of *Leaves of Grass* (1907), on the other hand, the translations of Whitman were scattered, yet the interest in him was very great, the critics vying with the poets in appreciation. In a word, French criticism has not been what one would assume, and it certainly has not been what the individual American researcher, picking up a few items relative to his author, has frequently represented it to be. M. Arnavon has seemingly canvassed everything: long runs of critical periodicals (he lists those that never mention Americans as well as those that do), doctoral theses, scattered essays in collected works, translations of American literary histories and their abridgements, and substantial treatments of individual authors. In my judgment, this is one of the most useful and illuminating studies made by a French scholar and critic (for M. Arnavon displays a taste and felicity lacking in many scholars) of American letters.

Professor Arnavon's study adds to my increasing conviction that an exhaustive survey of the reputation of a writer, or of a group of writers, in a foreign country can best be undertaken by a scholar of that country. I have been privy to two brilliant examinations of the reputations of Americans abroad by Americans—Donald Murray's study of the critical reception of Henry James in England and Gay Wilson Allen's account of Walt Whitman's reception by the world in that invaluable last chapter of his handbook, and I know something of the cost to each man through which these triumphs were achieved. The incomplete files of even our best libraries, so far as French reviews are concerned, would make the doing of anything comparable to M. Arnavon's study by an American impossible. We could contribute to international amity and better understanding by having more of our good doctoral candidates do studies of the *American* reputations of distinguished men of letters of other countries—with M. Arnavon's study as a model.

OSCAR CARGILL

*New York University*

---

*The Literary Criticism of "Young America": A Study in the Relationship of Politics and Literature 1837-1850.* By JOHN STAFFORD. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1952. pp. vi + 154. \$2.00.

Mr. Stafford has an exciting subject—the relation between politics and criticism in one of the most creative eras in American literature. "Young America" was a group led by E. A. Duyckinck, W. A. Jones, and Cornelius Mathews, working chiefly through the *Democratic Review*, *Arcturus*, and the *Literary World*, who allied themselves with the left-center Van Burenites known as the Young Hickories or Locofocos. They were for labor unions, universal education, literary nationalism, cheap books, and literature for the people; they were against the banking interests, monopoly, and aristocratic British cultural influence. They favored Emerson and the transcendentalists, Melville, Hawthorne, Bryant, and Simms, and neglected Longfellow, Irving, and Cooper. Their chief enemies were the *New York Review*, the *Whig Review*, the *Knickerbocker*, R. W. Griswold, G. W. Peck, and L. G. Clark.

The first two chapters which describe the history and alliances of these schools of opinion, are the best part of the book. Chapter Three describes adequately, but not critically, "Young America's" theory of criticism. Chapters Four and Five (one-half of the book) present rather mechanically the group's theory of literature, by genre, and their literary judgments, by period and author. Mr. Stafford tries to reduce the tiresome catalogue of classified excerpts from critical essays which seems to be inevitable in this type of study by restricting himself largely to the representative opinions of W. A. Jones in the *Democratic Review*, but he is trapped by his own method. For we are less interested in a clique's pronouncements on particular genres, periods, and authors than we are in the implications of their opinions. Mr. Stafford shows his awareness of some of the implications in his first and final chapters, but he is not deeply concerned with them in the book as a whole. He does not come to grips, for example, with the question, "What happens to a literature which makes a specific political alliance?" Actually, his subtitle is a misnomer, for he deals not at all with politics and literature but with politics and criticism. Young America's democratic theory of literature may have "had its culmination in . . . Walt Whitman," but one has only to read the major works of Emerson, Melville, and Hawthorne to be aware of the superficiality of their alliance with the radical Democrats.

Nevertheless, this is a valuable study, and its "Conclusion" contains questions and perceptions which make one look forward to Mr. Stafford's forthcoming over-all analysis of the criticism produced in these years.

WILLIAM CHARVAT

Ohio State University



## BRIEF MENTION

*The Rise of Words and their Meanings.* By SAMUEL REISS. New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. Pp. 301. \$3.75. Not infrequently words in the same or different languages are somewhat similar in both sound and meaning. When this is true a relationship may be suspected, and in many instances it can be demonstrated that such words are doublets, cognates, or are due to borrowing. There are of course well established procedures, requiring some technical knowledge, for tracing relationships like this. Mr. Reiss is skeptical about the validity of these procedures and believes the explanations they provide are inadequate. He offers instead his own "phoneto-semantic" explanation, a partial example of which follows: The words "*eat, bite, pick, peck, gnaw, nibble, pierce, cut, gash . . .*" are not only 'semantically interlocking' but via phoneto-semantic chains may be shown to be "phonetically interlocking." Thus we may link *pick—eat* by the following . . . chain: *pick—peck—whack—hack—hash . . . hatch . . . etch . . . . . eat . . .* [By] relative inversion . . . we link *bite—chip . . .* the *t* of *bite* being palatalized to the *ch . . .* We may also construe *eat—chew* as the inverse of each other with palatalization of *t* to *ch* as observed in *bite—chip . . .*" (pp. 166-7). Needless to say, this new procedure leads to some equally astonishing conclusions about word origins and the relationship of languages. To consider them seriously or to criticize them in detail would be a waste of effort.

NORMAN E. ELIASON

University of North Carolina

*Les Origines des chansons de geste; théories et discussions.* By ITALO SICILIANO. Traduit de l'italien par P. ANTONETTI. Paris: Picard, 1951. Pp. 231. 850 francs. This wise approach to the problem of the origins of the *chansons de geste* first appeared in Italian in 1940. Now made available in a French translation with a new preface by the author it deserves careful reading by all students of Old French literature. The book is especially welcome to the present reviewer since the ideas expressed by Siciliano so often coincide with her own (published in *Speculum* XIV, 1939, 209-14). For S. the sources of our poems may be as many and various as those alleged by his predecessors; they may be oral or written, lay or religious, legendary or historical—none seems to him to be a unique progenitor. He agrees with Bédier that the

poems took their rise in France in the eleventh century and believes that they are to be understood solely as manifestations of their place and time. S. rightly emphasizes the role of the originality and imaginative qualities of the poet in the evolution of the epic, but he fails, I think, to realize how large a part literary fashion played in their propagation. For a *déblaiement* of much waste land, however, and for a keen and sensible appraisal of the whole question before and especially since Bédier, this book is to be highly recommended.

G. F.

---

### CORRESPONDENCE

---

MILTON'S GOLDEN CHAIN. It has been asserted that Milton substitutes the golden ladder or stair of *Paradise Lost*, iii, 501-515, for the golden chain (ii, 1004-1006) by which the World is suspended from Heaven.<sup>1</sup> Recently, Don Cameron Allen has discovered in Bodin's *Heptaplomeres* (which, as he shows, Milton probably had read) a bit of dialogue wherein the Homeric chain is supposed to be nothing else but Jacob's ladder; he suggests that the passage is an analogue to Milton's conception of the heavenly stair.<sup>2</sup> In *Paradise Lost*, however, there is not a scrap of evidence to support the theory that the chain is superseded by the golden ladder. Though both stairway and chain stretch from Heaven to the zenith of the universe, and though both are gold, Milton never declares that they are one. Nowhere does he indicate that the golden stair is fastened to the World. And that the ladder is not the chain must be concluded from the fact that the ladder is sometimes withdrawn.

Each Stair mysteriously was meant, nor stood  
There alwaies but drawn up to Heav'n sometimes  
Viewless . . . (*P. L.*, iii, 516-518).<sup>3</sup>

Because Milton mentions the chain only once, it ought not to be discarded; without it the World would plunge downward into Chaos.

HARRY F. ROBINS

*University of Illinois*

---

<sup>1</sup> *Paradise Lost*, ed. Merritt Y. Hughes (New York, 1935), pp. xxii, 98n; Josephine Waters Bennett, "Milton's Use of the Vision of Er," *MP*, xxxvi (1939), 352, 353n.

<sup>2</sup> D. C. Allen, "Two Notes on *Paradise Lost*," *MLN*, LXVIII (May, 1953), 360.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *P. L.*, iii, 523: "The Stairs were *then* let down. . . ." Italics mine.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

Bauer, Josephine.—The London Magazine. *Copenhagen*: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1953. Pp. 362. (Anglistica, 1.)

Chapman, R. W.—Jane Austen: a Critical Bibliography. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press, 1953. Pp. viii + 62. \$2.25.

Cohen, Hennig.—The South Carolina Gazette, 1732-1775. *Columbia, S. C.*: Univ. of S. Carolina Press, 1953. Pp. xv + 273. \$6.00.

Doran, Madeline.—Endeavors of Art: A Study of Form in Elizabethan Drama. *Madison, Wisc.*: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1954. Pp. xv + 482. \$6.00.

Hankins, John E.—Shakespeare's Derived Imagery. *Lawrence, Kansas*: Univ. of Kansas Press, 1953. Pp. 289. \$5.00.

Hebel, J. W., Hudson, H. H., Johnson, F. R., Green, A. W., Hoopes, R. (eds.).—Tudor Poetry and Prose. *New York*: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953. Pp. xiii + 1375. \$7.50.

Holberg, Stanley M.—The Economic Rogue in the Plays of Bernard Shaw. Univ. of Buffalo, 1953. Pp. 33-119. \$.50. (Univ. of Buffalo Studies, Monographs in English, 5.)

Le Comte, Edward S.—Yet Once More: Verbal and Psychological Pattern in Milton. *New York*: Liberal Arts Press, 1953. Pp. ix + 192. \$4.50.

Parr, Johnstone.—Tamburlaine's Malady and other Essays on Astrology in Elizabethan Drama. *University, Alabama*: Univ. of Alabama Press, 1953. Pp. xiv + 158. \$3.50.

Rota, Feliciana.—William Collins. *Padua*: Antonio Milani, 1953. Pp. 171. (Collana Critica, 1.)

Schmidt, Karlernst.—Anglistische Bücherkunde, eine Auswahlbibliographie für Studierende. *Tübingen*: Max Niemeyer, 1953. Pp. iv + 60.

Shine, Hill.—Carlyle's Early Reading, to 1834, with an Introductory Essay on his Intellectual Development. *Lexington, Ky.*: Margaret I. King Library, 1953. Pp. 353. (University of Kentucky Libraries, Occasional Contribution, no. 57.)

Tracy, Clarence.—The Artificial Bastard, a Biography of Richard Savage. *Cambridge,*

*Mass.*: Harvard Univ. Press, 1953. Pp. xvii + 164. \$4.50.

Webster, Noah.—Letters. Ed. by Harry R. Warfel. *New York*: Library Publishers, 1953. Pp. xli + 562. \$7.50.

## GERMAN

Andreas, Willy.—Carl August von Weimar. Ein Leben mit Goethe, 1757-1783. *Stuttgart*: Gustav Kilpper, 1953. 612 pp., 8 plates. DM 19.80.

Baetke, W. u. Walter E. (ed.).—De Eikbom. E. Auswahl niederdeutscher Dichtungen. *Halle*: Max Niemeyer, 1953. 193 pp. DM 7.50.

Eichner, Hans.—Thomas Mann. Eine Einführung in sein Werk [Sammlung Dalp Band 58]. *Bern*: Francke, 1953. 124 pp. SFr 4.80.

Fairley, Barker.—Goethe's Faust. Six Essays. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press, 1953. vi + 132 pp. \$3.—

Götze, A. u. Schmitt, L. E. (ed.).—Aus dem sozialen u. politischen Kampf. Die 12 Artikel d. Bauern 1525. Hans Hergot, Von d. neuen Wandlung 1527. [Neudrucke dt. Liter. werke d. 16. 17. Jh. Nr. 322: Flugschriften a. d. Reformationzeit. 20] *Halle*: Max Niemeyer, 1953. 64 pp. DM 2.30.

Grillparzer, Franz.—Sappho. Tragedy in Five Acts, translated by Arthur Burkhart. *Yarmouth Port*: Register Press, 1953. 99 pp.

Muschg, Walter.—Tragische Literaturgeschichte. Zweite, umgearbeit. u. stark erweit. Auflage. *Bern*: Francke, 1953. 747 pp. Sfr. 34.—

## SCANDINAVIAN

Hønsa Þóris saga, ed. Walter Baetke. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1953. 121 pp. DM 3.60.

Sveinsson, E. Ó.—The Age of the Sturlings. Icelandic Civilization in the Thirteenth Century. *Ithaca*: Cornell U. Press, 1953. xvi + 183 pp. \$4.00.

## FRENCH

Accaputo, Nino.—La lingua francese studiata nei suoni. *Palermo*: Del Gaudio, 1952. 245 pp.

Balzac.—Les Chouans, éd. Pierre d'Espezel. *Paris*: Club bibliophile de France, 1952. 358 pp.

— La Comédie humaine (Etudes de mœurs, scènes de la vie privée), éd. A. Prioult. 2 v. *Paris*: Hazan, 1952. Fr. 1800.

— Le Cousin Pons, éd. Bernard Guyon. *Paris*: Club fr. du livre, 1952. 390 pp. Fr. 660.

— Œuvres choisies, éd. Bouteron et Pommier. 10 vol. *Paris*: Impr. nationale, 1950.

— Une ténébreuse affaire, éd. Alain. *Paris*: Club fr. du livre, 1952. 270 pp. Fr. 600.

Bruneau, Charles.—Bossuet, Oraison funèbre d'Anne de Gonzague. *Paris*: Centre de doc. univ., 1952-3. 200 pp. Fr. 750.

— La Langue de Balzac. *Paris*: Tournier et Constans, 1951-2. 219 pp.

Cavallucci, Giacomo.—Les derniers grands salons littéraires français. *Naples*: Pironti, 1952. 304 pp. L. 2200.

Faral, Edmond.—Guillaume de Digulleville, moine de Châalis. *Paris*: Impr. nat., 1952. 132 pp.

Langellier and Longi.—A Recording Based on Micks and Longi, *New Fundamental French*, Lessons I-X. *New York*: Oxford U. Press, Dec., 1953.

Mézeray.—Observations sur l'orthographe de la langue fr., éd. Ch. Beaulieux. *Paris*: Champion, 1951. 269 pp. Fr. 1200.

Planche, Henry.—Mérimée. *Chambéry*: Foyer litt., 1952. 29 pp. Fr. 150.

Pognard, Gaston.—Le parler franco-provençal d'Aiript, Deux-Sèvres. *La Rochelle*: l'auteur, 1952. xiv + 267 pp. Fr. 1150.

Ricca, Fernando.—Ricordando Giulio Verne. *Rieti*: Faraoni, 1952. 31 pp.

Romains, Jules.—Choix de textes, bibliog., poèmes inédits, éd. André Figueras. *Paris*: Seghers, 1952. 223 pp. Fr. 390.

Sauro, Antonio.—Grammatica storica della lingua francese. 3 v. *Bari*: Adriatica editrice, 1952. 272 + 151 + 107 pp. L. 4200.

Shaw, E. P.—The Case of the Abbé de Monerif, an episode in French society of the eighteenth century. *New York*: Bookman Associates, 1953. 55 pp. \$2.50.

Siciliano, Italo.—Corneille. *Venice*: La goliardica, 1952. 251 pp.

Sion, Georges.—La Conversation française. *Paris*: Baude, 1952. 291 pp. Fr. 750.

Solmi, Sergio.—La salute di Montaigne e altri scritti di lett. francese. *Milan*: Ricciardi, 1952. 221 pp.

Soreil, Arsène.—Entretiens sur l'art d'écrire. *Paris*: Baude, 1952. 302 pp. Fr. 550.

Sorrento, Luigi.—Dal Parnaso al simbo-

lismo. *Milan*: La goliardica, 1952. 113 pp. L. 750.

— L'opera poetica e la modernità di Jean Racine. *Ibid.*, 1952. 118 pp.

Starobinski, Jean.—Montesquieu par lui-même. *Paris*: Eds. du Seuil, 1953. 192 pp.

Stendhal.—Œuvres. Nouvelles. Souvenirs d'égotisme. Journal. Ed. H. Martineau et F.-R. Bastide. *Paris*: Club fr. du livre, 1952. xvi + 718 pp. Fr. 1650.

Verhaeren.—Choix de textes, bibliog., éd. Franz Hellens. *Paris*: Seghers, 1952. 223 pp. Fr. 390.

Villon.—Œuvres, éd. R. H. Guerrand. *Paris*: Club fr. du livre, 1952. 222 pp. Fr. 1225.

### PROVENÇAL

Brunel, Clovis (ed.).—Les Plus anciennes chartes en langue provençale. *Paris*: Picard, 1952. xl + 279 pp. Fr. 2800.

Camproux, Charles.—Histoire de la litt. occitane. *Paris*: Payot, 1953. 220 pp. Fr. 195.

Stimm, Helmut.—Studien zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Franko-provenzalischen. *Mainz*: Akad. der Wissenschaften und der Lit., 1953. 160 pp. DM 12.

Viscardi, Alberto.—Letterature d'oc e d'oïl. *Milan*: Ed. Academia, 1952. 518 pp.

### ITALIAN

Alighieri, Dante.—Convivio, ed. G. R. Cerriello. *Milan*: Rizzoli, 1952. 379 pp. L. 240.

— La Divina Commedia illustrata. Inferno. Ed. Ugolino Ferranti. *Milan*: A. e C., 1952. 250 pp. L. 600.

— Inferno, ed. Sinibaldo Folchitto. *Rome*: Merlo, 1952. xxxii + 904 pp. L. 1500.

Amadio, Giulio.—Toponomastica Marchigiana. Vol. I. *Montalto Marche*: Tip. Sisto V, 1952. 145 pp. L. 550.

Benedetti, Andrea.—La cultura umanistica in Pordenone. *Pordenone*: Cosarini, 1952. 50 pp.

Casnati, Fr.—Marino Moretti. *Milan*: Ipl, 1952. 133 pp. L. 500.

Catalano, Michele, etc.—L'Epopea eroica e cavalleresca in Sicilia. *Messina*: D'Anna, 1952. 145 pp. L. 1300.

Devoto, Giacomo.—Profilo di storia linguistica italiana. *Florence*: La Nuova Italia, 1953. 173 pp.

Di Pino, Guido.—La figurazione della luce nella "Divina Commedia." *Florence*: La nuova Italia, 1952. x + 181 pp.

Maggio Valveri, G.—L'ellenismo in Foscolo. *Palermo*: Pezzino, 1952. 143 pp. L. 1000.

Manzoni.—I Promessi sposi, ed. Mario Lepore. *Milan*: Ed. Viola, 1952. 947 pp.

Nuovi (ed.).—Testi fiorentini del Dugento. T. I e II. *Florence*: Sansoni, 1952. xii + 949 pp. L. 9500.

Paparelli, G.—Introd. allo studio della lingua poetica del Novecento. *Naples*: Ist. della stampa, 1952. 23 pp.

Rosina, Tito.—Saggi dannunziani. *Genoa*: Del Mastro, 1952. 301 pp. L. 1000.

Russo, Luigi.—Corso su Carducci. *Pisa*: Libreria goliardica, 1952. 148 pp. L. 700.

—L' "Orlando innamorato" di M. M. Boiardo. *Ibid.*, 1952. 63 pp. L. 400.

Salmi, Mario.—Lezioni sul concetto di Rinascimento. *Rome*: Ateneo, 1952. 176 pp. L. 900.

Santangelo, Giorgio.—Lineamenti di storia della lett. in Sicilia dal secolo XIII ai nostri giorni. *Palermo*: Ediz. boaniane, 1952. 167 pp. L. 1300.

Sapegno, Natalino.—Commento alle rime del Poliziano. *Rome*: Ateneo, 1952. 336 pp.

Scolari, Antonio.—Anna da Schio Serego Alighieri e gli inizi del romanticismo patriottico a Verona. *Verona*: Vita Veronese, 1952. 78 pp.

Senesi, Ivo.—Ricordo di Renato Simoni. *Milan*: Gastaldi, 1952. 111 pp. L. 300.

## ROMANSH

Caduff, Léonard.—Essai sur la phonétique du parler rhétoroman de la Vallée de Tavetsch. *Lausanne diss.*, 1952. xvi + 229 pp.

## SPANISH

Alas, Leopoldo.—Cuentos de Clarín, ed. Laura de los Ríos de García Lorca. *Boston*: Houghton Mifflin, 1954. xxvi + 193 pp. \$2.50.

Barreiro, J. M. V.—El lusitanismo de Lope de Vega y su comedia *El Brasil restituido*. *Coimbra*: Editora Coimbra, 1950. 352 pp.

Barrera, Claudio.—Antología de poetas jóvenes de Honduras desde 1935. *Tegucigalpa*: 1950. 189 pp.

Campillo de Bayle, G.—Gustos y disgustos del Lentiscar de Cartagena. *Madrid*: Colección Almenara, 1949. xviii + 330 pp.

Cruz Rueda, Ángel.—A. Palacio Valdés. *Madrid*: S. A. E. T. A., 1949. 221 pp.

Desclot, Bernat.—Crónica, ed. Coll i Alentorn. 3 vol. *Barcelona*: Barcino, 1949.

García Blanco, M.—Salamanca y la literatura. *Salamanca*: Escuela Social, 1949. 23 pp.

Guarnieri, J. C.—Versos gauchescos y nativistas: Breve antol. de poetas uruguayos. *Montevideo*: Florensa, 1949. 129 pp.

Horrego, Leopoldo.—Plácido, el poeta infortunado. *Havana*: Edit. Mecenaz, 1949.

Izquierdo Ríos, Fr.—Vallejo y su tierra. *Lima*: Rimac, 1949. 78 pp.

Jover, J. María.—1653, Hist. de una polémica y semblanza de una generación. *Madrid*: C. S. I. C., 1949, 565 pp.

Llull, Ramón.—Libro de amigo y amado, ed. Martín de Riquer. *Barcelona*: Flors, 1950. 160 pp.

Macedo Arguedas, A.—Antol. de las letras puneñas. *Puno, Peru*: Laikakota, 1949. 128 pp.

Margali, F. A.—Obras completas. T. I. Pról. de F. J. Santamaría. *Tabasco*: Gobierno del Estado, 1949. 317 pp.

Mateos, Agustín.—Etimologías griegas del español. *México*: Porrúa, 1949. 373 pp.

Montoto, Santiago.—Contrib. al vocab. de Lope de Vega. *Madrid*: 1949. 116 pp.

Noé, Julio.—Curso y antología de lit. hispanoamericana y especialmente argentina. *Buenos Aires*: 1949. 797 pp.

Oyuela, Calixto.—Poetas hispanoamericanos. *Buenos Aires*: Acad. Arg. de Letras, 1949.

Pagès, Amédée (ed.).—Les "Coblas" ou les poésies lyriques provenço-catalanes de Jacme, Pere et Arnau March. *Toulouse*: Privat, 1949. 142 pp.

Palacín Iglesias, G. B.—Hist. de la lit. esp. *México*: Aldina, 1949. 362 pp.

Pareja Fernández, E.-M.—El manuscrito Luliano Torcaz I. *La Laguna de Tenerife*: Facultad, 1949. 216 pp.

Parrot, Louis.—F. G. Lorca. *Paris*: Seghers, 1949. 216 pp.

Perry, Janet H. (ed.).—The Heath Anthology of Sp. Poetry. *Boston*: Heath [1953?]. 468 pp. \$3.75.



**Prado, Pedro.**—Antología, las estancias del amor, ed. R. Silva Castro. *Santiago de Chile*: Edit. del Pacífico, 1949. 158 pp.

**Rodríguez Aragón, Mario.**—Diccionario técnico de pesas, medidas y monedas. *Madrid*: Inst. Geográfico y Catastral, 1949. 204 pp.

**Rojas, Ricardo.**—Historia de la lit. argentina. 8 vols. *Buenos Aires*: Losada, 1948-49.

**Romeu i Figueras, J.**—Cançons nadalenques del segle xv. *Barcelona*: Barcino, 1949. 184 pp.

**Rosselló-Porcel, V.**—Obra poetica, ed. Salvador Espriu. *Palma de Mallorca*: R. O. D. A., 1949. 173 pp.

**Sanz y Díaz, J.**—El tema mariano en los poemas de América. *Lérida*: Acad. Mariana, 1949. 86 pp.

**Segura Covarsi, E.**—La canción petrarquista en la lírica esp. del Siglo de Oro. *Madrid*: C. S. I. C., 1949. 333 pp.

**Torres-Rioseco, A. (ed.)**—Antol. de poetas precusores del modernismo. *Washington*: Panamerican Union, 1949. 108 pp.

— Ensayos sobre lit. latinoamericana. *Berkeley and L. A.*: U. of Cal. Press, 1953. 209 pp. \$3.00.

**Vera, Diego de.**—Cancionero llamado Danza de Galanes. *Valencia*: Castalia, 1949. 65 pp.

**Viñas Olivella.**—Estampas de vida de Cervantes. *Madrid*: 1949.

**Vossler, Karl.**—Die Poesie der Einsamkeit in Spanien. *Munich*: 1949. 400 pp.

**Zamora Lucas, F.**—Evocación de Tirso en sus conventos de Soria y Almazán. *Madrid*: Revista "Estudios," 1949.

### PORTUGUESE

**Bandeira, Manuel.**—Antología dos poetas brasileiros de face romântica. *Rio de Janeiro*: Imprensa Nacional, 1949. 390 pp.

**Carvalho, C. A.**—A profilaxia da língua portuguesa. *Oporto*: Imprensa Social, 1949. 28 pp.

**Coelho, J. do Prado.**—Diversidade e unidade em Fernando Pessoa. *Lisbon*: Revista Occidente, 1949. 126 pp.

**Dionísio, Sant'Ana.**—A sinceridade política de Antero. *Oporto*: 1949. 80 pp.

**Ducros, Charles.**—Inês de Castro. *Paris*: Blanchard, 1949. 135 pp.

**Fontes, Henrique.**—Estudinhos antropológicos. *Florianópolis*: 1949. 32 pp.

**Guimarães, L. de Oliveira.**—Lisboa e Eça de Queiroz. *Lisbon*: Portugalia Edit., 1949. 163 pp.

**Lima, J. A. P. de.**—A tetralogia n' "Os Lusíadas." *Oporto*: 1949. 48 pp.

**Nascimento, Cabral do.**—Poemas narrativos portugueses. *Lisbon*: Minerva, 1949. 319 pp.

**Paiva Boléo, M. de.**—Defesa e ilustração da língua. *Coimbra*: 1949. 87 pp.

**Paxeco, Elza.**—Galicismos arcaicos. *Lisbon*: Revista de Portugal, 1949. 104 pp.

**Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Luso-Brazilian Studies.** *Nashville*: Vanderbilt U. Press, 1953. xii + 335 pp.

**Ribeiro, M. S.**—O drama de Gomes Leal. *Lisbon*: Câmara Municipal, 1949. 56 pp.

**Rossi, G. C.**—Curso di lingua e lett. portoghese. *Rome*: La goliardica, 1952. 226 pp.

**Sousa e Costa, Julio de.**—Eça de Queirós. Memórias de sua estadia em Leiria, 1870-71. *Lisbon*: 1953.

### RUMANIAN

**Guillermou, Alain.**—Manuel de langue roumaine. *Paris*: Klincksieck, 1953. 287 pp. Fr. 1000.

**Mario Roques et les études roumaines.** *Paris*: Inst. Univ. roumain Charles 1<sup>er</sup>, 1953. 221 pp.

### RUSSIAN

**Coulson, J. and N. Duddington (eds.)**—Russian Short Stories. *Oxford*: Clarendon [N. Y.: Oxford] Press, 1953. 240 pp. \$3.00.

**Troyat, Henri.**—Pouchkine, biographie. *Paris*: Plon, 1953. ii + 847 pp. Fr. 1650.

### GENERAL

**Hakamies, Reino.**—Etude sur l'origine et l'évolution du diminutif latin et sa survie dans les langues romanes. *Helsinki*: Annales Acad. Scient., 1951. 148 pp.

**Hill, Archibald A. (ed.)**—Report of the Fourth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Teaching. *Washington*: Georgetown U. Press, 1953. 116 pp.

**Paiva Boléo, M. de.**—Os estudos de linguística românica desde 1939 a 1948. *Coimbra*: Castelo Edit., 1951. xi + 521 pp.

**Weidner, Alfred.**—Lautsymbolisches "i" in der romanischen sprachschöpfung. *Munich* diss., 1950.



1954

atropo-

e Eça

1949.

" " Os

arrati-

1949.

tração

Lis-

pp.

Col-

Nash-

+ 335

Leal.

pp.

porto-

26 pp.

ueirón.

70-71.

angue

287

aines.

1953.

(s.).-

endon

\$3.00.

phia.

550.

ne et

urvie

An-

f the

g on

ash-

6 pp.

lin-

oim-

" ; "

Mu-

34

—

ga

39.

Os

ti-

39.

ho

ie-

pl-

h-

35

al.

to-

pp.

6s.

71.

que

287

es.

53.

—

lon

00.

ie.

0.

et

vie

an-

the

on

sh-

pp.

in-

m-

i "

fu-

E. M. W. Tillyard

AUTHOR OF

*Studies in Milton*

*The Elizabethan World Picture*

*The Poetry of Sir Thomas Wyatt*

NOW WRITES

# THE ENGLISH RENAISSANCE: *FACT OR FICTION?*

A noted English scholar here examines the Mediaeval and Renaissance traditions in an attempt to determine how great an upheaval, how marked a change, occurred in English literature during the transitional period. Setting forth certain differences in English habits of thought and artistic attitudes during the two epochs, Professor Tillyard tests and illustrates them in three widely separated areas of literature: the lyric, the epic, and literary criticism. \$3.00

The Johns Hopkins Press  
Baltimore 18, Md.

De Amicis

## CUORE, Revised

Edited by Olin H. Moore  
and D. P. Rotunda

Heath's revised edition brings this famous classic down to the level of the high school or beginning college student. Plentiful footnotes help to translate difficult passages and offer a guide for pronunciation and grammar review. Simplified exercises, patterned on the requirements for Regents examinations, provide a sound, comprehensive grammar review. All the directions have been given in English instead of Italian. Four short stories have been substituted for the longer, more difficult *Dagli Appennini alle Ande* in this ever-popular schoolboy's journal.



D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Sales Offices: New York 14 Chicago 16 San Francisco 5  
Atlanta 3 Dallas 1 Home Office: Boston 16

❖ JAMES C. McLAREN ❖

## THE THEATRE OF ANDRÉ GIDE

### *Evolution of a Moral Philosopher*

This first complete study of Gide's theatre considers his plays and dialogues as psychological documents which reveal more accurately than any other genre the succeeding phases of his development as moral philosopher and esthetician.

The dramatic form is naturally suited to an externalization of Gide's moral conflict, and the protagonists of his theatre represent the participants in a constantly changing inner dialogue of moral extremes.

1953

127 pages

\$3.00



*The Johns Hopkins Press*

HOMEWOOD • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND